

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB7	Ten Acre is also a more sensitive location close to Smarts Heath Common (SSSI). The increase of pitches would have an impact on wildlife and also on visual amenity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Criticisms made regarding the Council's previous planning decisions. Suggests that the proposals for Mayford would be amongst these bad decisions. Where it is believed that no consideration has been given to the local infrastructure (no suitable road; no shops; little or no public transport; no school places and no prospect of improvements)	None stated.	<p>The Council makes planning recommendations based on robust evidence and policy framework, however it is appreciated that there will not always be collective support for certain proposals. The Planning system is a statutory and regulatory process, where specific procedures have to be met. This includes statutory consultation and engagement with the local community and specific bodies during the planning application stage and plan making process (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0) to seek comments. Decisions are informed by comments where relevant.</p> <p>With regards to the representation regarding infrastructure, this has been comprehensively addressed in 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Criticisms made regarding the Council's previous planning decisions. Suggests that the proposals for Mayford would be amongst these bad decisions. Where it is believed that no consideration has been given to the local infrastructure (no suitable road; no shops; little or no public transport; no school places and no prospect of improvements)	None stated.	<p>The Council makes planning recommendations based on robust evidence and policy framework, however it is appreciated that there will not always be collective support for certain proposals. The Planning system is a statutory and regulatory process, where specific procedures have to be met. This includes statutory consultation and engagement with the local community and specific bodies during the planning application stage and plan making process (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0) to seek comments. Decisions are informed by comments where relevant.</p> <p>With regards to the representation regarding infrastructure, this has been comprehensively addressed in 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Criticisms made regarding the Council's previous planning decisions. Suggests that the proposals for Mayford would be amongst these bad decisions. Where it is believed that no consideration has been given to the local infrastructure (no suitable road; no shops; little or no public transport; no school places and no prospect of improvements)	None stated.	<p>The Council makes planning recommendations based on robust evidence and policy framework, however it is appreciated that there will not always be collective support for certain proposals. The Planning system is a statutory and regulatory process, where specific procedures have to be met. This includes statutory consultation and engagement with the local community and specific bodies during the planning application stage and plan making process (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0) to seek comments. Decisions are informed by comments where relevant. With regards to the representation regarding infrastructure, this has been comprehensively addressed in 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Criticisms made regarding the Council's previous planning decisions. Suggests that the proposals for Mayford would be amongst these bad decisions. Where it is believed that no consideration has been given to the local infrastructure (no suitable road; no shops; little or no public transport; no school places and no prospect of improvements)	None stated.	<p>The Council makes planning recommendations based on robust evidence and policy framework, however it is appreciated that there will not always be collective support for certain proposals. The Planning system is a statutory and regulatory process, where specific procedures have to be met. This includes statutory consultation and engagement with the local community and specific bodies during the planning application stage and plan making process (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0) to seek comments. Decisions are informed by comments where relevant.</p> <p>With regards to the representation regarding infrastructure, this has been comprehensively addressed in 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Object to housing proposals in Mayford. The proposals would destroy the character of Mayford, and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. No consideration has been given to preserving the character and keeping the settlement of Mayford separate	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 12.0. See also Section 23.0</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Object to housing proposals in Mayford. The proposals would destroy the character of Mayford, and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. No consideration has been given to preserving the character and keeping the settlement of Mayford separate	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 12.0. See also 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Object to housing proposals in Mayford. The proposals would destroy the character of Mayford, and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. No consideration has been given to preserving the character and keeping the settlement of Mayford separate	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 12.0. See also 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Object to housing proposals in Mayford. The proposals would destroy the character of Mayford, and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. No consideration has been given to preserving the character and keeping the settlement of Mayford separate	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 12.0. See also 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Highlights the strong heritage of Mayford village.	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Highlights the strong heritage of Mayford village.	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Highlights the strong heritage of Mayford village.	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Highlights the strong heritage of Mayford village.	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Proposals will have an impact on Wildlife, particularly through its proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Proposals will have an impact on Wildlife, particularly through its proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Proposals will have an impact on Wildlife, particularly through its proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Proposals will have an impact on Wildlife, particularly through its proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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</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
						adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB7	Previous planning decisions have refused permission here as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Object to proposals on land around Mayford Village Hall. It is believed that residents have been misled about the ownership of the sites. It is believed that the Council has an invested interest in the sites being adopted for development. It is requested that the Council clarify its position and its interest in the sites and then follow this up with further public consultation.	None stated.	The ownership of the site has not affected the site selection process. However the availability of the site is a significant consideration as it is an indicator of whether the site is deliverable. This has been 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Object to proposals on land around Mayford Village Hall. It is believed that residents have been misled about the ownership of the sites. It is believed that the Council has an invested interest in the sites being adopted for development. It is requested that the Council clarify its position and its interest in the sites and then follow this up with further public consultation.	None stated.	The ownership of the site has not affected the site selection process. However the availability of the site is a significant consideration as it is an indicator of whether the site is deliverable. This has been 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB7	Object to proposals to increase the number of pitches at Ten Acre. Mayford already contributes significantly to the Traveller community, with one of the main Traveller sites in the Borough located 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Suggests that no regard has been given to the transport infrastructure. An addition of 2000 new people will add pressure to existing problems. Existing problems include- poor access to Woking and Worplesdon station. Traffic on road (inc Egley Road and Prey Heath Road), lack of pavements and inadequate lighting.	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, Section 20.0 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. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</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>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Suggests that no regard has been given to the transport infrastructure. An addition of 2000 new people will add pressure to existing problems. Existing problems include- poor access to Woking and Worplesdon station. Traffic on road (inc Egley Road and Prey Heath Road), lack of pavements and inadequate lighting.	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, Section 20.0 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. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</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>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Suggests that no regard has been given to the transport infrastructure. An addition of 2000 new people will add pressure to existing problems. Existing problems include- poor access to Woking and Worplesdon station. Traffic on road (inc Egley Road and Prey Heath Road), lack of pavements and inadequate lighting.	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, Section 20.0 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. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. As part of Transport 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 unlit 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Suggests that no regard has been given to the transport infrastructure. An addition of 2000 new people will add pressure to existing problems. Existing problems include- poor access to Woking and Worplesdon station. Traffic on road (inc Egley Road and Prey Heath Road), lack of pavements and inadequate lighting.	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, Section 20.0 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. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.  As part of Transport 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 unlit 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
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB8	Highlight that Mayford and Hook Heath residents have been successful in defending the GB in these areas in previous decisions for development. Proposals have not considered the local infrastructure. There are no school places, poor public transport, and notoriously dangerous road (junction Blackhorse Rd and Saunders Lane).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB9	Highlight that Mayford and Hook Heath residents have been successful in defending the GB in these areas in previous decisions for development. Proposals have not considered the local infrastructure. There are no school places, poor public transport, and notoriously dangerous road (junction Blackhorse Rd and Saunders Lane).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB10	Highlight that Mayford and Hook Heath residents have been successful in defending the GB in these areas in previous decisions for development. Proposals have not considered the local infrastructure. There are no school places, poor public transport, and notoriously dangerous road (junction Blackhorse Rd and Saunders Lane).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
298	Lawrence	Caffrey	GB11	Highlight that Mayford and Hook Heath residents have been successful in defending the GB in these areas in previous decisions for development. Proposals have not considered the local infrastructure. There are no school places, poor public transport, and notoriously dangerous road (junction Blackhorse Rd and Saunders Lane).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 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
812	Fabien	Callens	General	Neutral	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
812	Fabien	Callens	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. It is very disappointing.	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
812	Fabien	Callens	Summary of Key Challenges and Sustainability Issues facing the Borough	The existing infrastructure is inadequate and must be rectified before any developments.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB12	There are growing traffic problems on Coldharbour Rd. Safety concerns raised- Several incidents have occurred where pedestrians have been at risk from vehicles and accidents occurring.	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
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB12	Local medical practice is at full capacity. There are frequent difficulties getting an appointment and there are long waiting lists. The problem will get worse.	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
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB12	The local primary school is oversubscribed. The proposals will mean that local children can not attend local schools.  Strongly object to plans given its impact on the community and local services	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB13	There are growing traffic problems on Coldharbour Rd. Safety concerns raised- Several incidents have occurred where pedestrians have been at risk from vehicles and accidents occurring.	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
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB13	The local medical practice is at full capacity. There are frequent difficulties getting an appointment and there are long waiting lists. The problem will get worse.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
34	Annabel	Cameron	GB13	The local primary school is oversubscribed. The proposals will mean that local children can not attend local schools.  Strongly object to plans given its impact on the community and local services	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
116	Derek	Candey	GB12	Does not want to see Green Belt land released for 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
116	Derek	Candey	GB13	Does not want to see Green Belt land released for 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
973	Liz	Candey	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Greenbelt land is a place of natural beauty. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Greenbelt shouldn't be built upon where there are other sites in nearby towns with derelict properties that would benefit from additional housing.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  Adjoining authorities will be under similar pressures to deliver housing to address the unmet housing need. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. Additionally, the Council will work constructively and positively with adjoining authorities and key stakeholders to consider cross boundary strategic matters, including the potential cumulative impact of development proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
973	Liz	Candey	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Greenbelt land is a place of natural beauty. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Greenbelt shouldn't be built upon where there are other sites in nearby towns with derelict properties that would benefit from additional housing.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  Adjoining authorities will be under similar pressures to deliver housing to address the unmet housing need. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. Additionally, the Council will work constructively and positively with adjoining authorities and key stakeholders to consider cross boundary strategic matters, including the potential cumulative impact of development proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB12	Concern for change in the character of the village. The school, bungalows and houses built earlier already a tragic sacrifice of agricultural land for unsightly development.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB13	Concern for change in the character of the village. The school, bungalows and houses built earlier already a tragic sacrifice of agricultural land for unsightly development.	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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. Overall, the development will be sustainable as it is expected to be supported by necessary infrastructure. It is not expected that the proposals will adversely impact on the most versatile agricultural land in the area.	
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB12	I am writing to protest at plans to develop the fields, the development will place an unacceptable burden on infrastructure (traffic, amenities and services). The main road through the village is busy and dangerous on Sundays and school days, with near misses. More children or traffic would make accidents and possibly fatalities almost inevitable.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB13	I am writing to protest at plans to develop the fields, the development will place an unacceptable burden on infrastructure (traffic, amenities and services). The main road through the village is busy and dangerous on Sundays and school days, with near misses. More children or traffic would make accidents and possibly fatalities almost inevitable.	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 justify the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB12	Nothing has changed - a quick fix to central government demand for more housing results in the rape of a green field site as its cheaper, easier, quicker, makes more money for developers and more rates for the Council. Despite direction that brownfield sites should be prioritised. Urge you to drop the brownfield site in Pyrford instead to preserve character.	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
1121	Andrew	Carapiet	GB13	Nothing has changed - a quick fix to central government demand for more housing results in the rape of a green field site as its cheaper, easier, quicker, makes more money for developers and more rates for the Council. Despite direction that brownfield sites should be prioritised. Urge you to drop the brownfield site in Pyrford instead to preserve character.	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
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	Any housing provided should meet local housing needs, including affordable housing, specialist housing for the elderly, disabled and other needs. A significant proportion of the site, and more than 25%, should be allocated for self build housing for local residents of Woking to have priority. At least 50% of proposed sites should be allocated for specialist/ local needs.	None stated.	Development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including the elderly, disabled and those with other needs. This would be in accordance with relevant Core Strategy policies (CS11, CS12 and CS13). Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the local housing needs mentioned. While self build housing is not specifically required as part of the allocation, the Council offers in principle support for it through the emerging Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	Any housing provided should meet local housing needs, including affordable housing, specialist housing for the	None stated.	Development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including the elderly, disabled and those with other needs. This would be in accordance 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
				elderly, disabled and other needs. A significant proportion of the site, and more than 25%, should be allocated for self build housing for local residents of Woking to have priority. At least 50% of proposed sites should be allocated for specialist/ local needs.		relevant Core Strategy policies (CS11, CS12 and CS13). Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the local housing needs mentioned. While self build housing is not specifically required as part of the allocation, the Council offers in principle support for it through the emerging Development Management Policies DPD.	of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	General	Any housing provided should meet local housing needs, including affordable housing, specialist housing for the elderly, disabled and other needs. A significant proportion of the site, and more than 25%, should be allocated for self build housing for local residents of Woking to have priority. At least 50% of proposed sites should be allocated for specialist/ local needs.	None stated.	Development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including the elderly, disabled and those with other needs. This would be in accordance with relevant Core Strategy policies (CS11, CS12 and CS13). Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the local housing needs mentioned. While self build housing is not specifically required as part of the allocation, the Council offers in principle support for it through the emerging Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	Comments relate to the two sites at Upshot Lane, Pyrford and generally to similar proposals. Appreciates the difficult position of the Council to meet top down government targets which do not take account of local circumstances. This approach should be opposed and a national strategy adopted to meet the future housing crisis for the whole country. Woking is being forced to make decisions to meet wider population growth and south east housing pressures over which is has no control.	None stated.	Comment noted, particularly for its acknowledgement of the wider context and the Council's position within this. However, it should be noted that housing targets set by government are part of its strategy to tackle the housing crisis, and it is for local authorities, through their Local Plans, to ensure that the local targets set account for local circumstances and constraints. The target set by Woking Borough Council in its adopted Core Strategy accounts for these considerations, and is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Section 2.0 may also be of interest in relation to this site's proposed allocation. It should also be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	Comments relate to the two sites at Upshot Lane, Pyrford and generally to similar proposals. Appreciates the difficult position of the Council to meet top down government targets which do not take account of local circumstances. This approach should be opposed and a national strategy adopted to meet the future housing crisis for the whole country. Woking is being forced to make decisions to meet wider population growth and south east housing pressures over which is has no control.	None stated.	Comment noted, particularly for its acknowledgement of the wider context and the Council's position within this. However, it should be noted that housing targets set by government are part of its strategy to tackle the housing crisis, and it is for local authorities, through their Local Plans, to ensure that the local targets set account for local circumstances and constraints. The target set by Woking Borough Council in its adopted Core Strategy accounts for these considerations, and is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Section 2.0 may also be of interest in relation to this site's proposed allocation. It should also be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	General	Comments relate to the two sites at Upshot Lane, Pyrford and generally to similar proposals. Appreciates the difficult position of the Council to meet top down government targets which do not take account of local circumstances. This approach should be opposed and a national strategy adopted to meet the future housing crisis for the whole country. Woking is being forced to make decisions to meet wider population growth and south east housing pressures over which is has no control.	None stated.	Comment noted, particularly for its acknowledgement of the wider context and the Council's position within this. However, it should be noted that housing targets set by government are part of its strategy to tackle the housing crisis, and it is for local authorities, through their Local Plans, to ensure that the local targets set account for local circumstances and constraints. The target set by Woking Borough Council in its adopted Core Strategy accounts for these considerations, and is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Section 2.0 may also be of interest in relation to the Pyrford sites' proposed allocations. It should also be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	The strong policies and proposals as set out will justify the release of Green Belt land, without them release will not be justified.	None stated.	Comment noted. Development will have to meet the key requirements listed in the draft allocations, and also Core Strategy and other Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	The strong policies and proposals as set out will justify the release of Green Belt land, without them release will not be justified.	None stated.	Comment noted. Development will have to meet the key requirements listed in the draft allocations, and also Core Strategy and other Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	General	The strong policies and proposals as set out will justify the release of Green Belt land, without them release will not be justified.	None stated.	Comment noted. Development will have to meet the key requirements listed in the draft allocations, and also Core Strategy and other Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development. Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In terms of healthcare, 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
					will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.		
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development. Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In terms of healthcare, 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
478	Steve	Cardis	General	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.	Increased land value/ profit from any development decision should be available to the community to fund infrastructure the development will require. This would help overcome many objections made regarding lack of infrastructure.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development. Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In terms of healthcare, 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
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	In circumstances where government policy does not facilitate this funding, the Council should carry out its own Financial Appraisal of likely infrastructure costs, and include strong policies and requirements for any land purchaser or developer. Thereby windfall profit would be reduced to more realistic levels and infrastructure funding secured.	None stated.	Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy (to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development) and the appraisal of infrastructure need and requirements in the Borough can be found in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, available on its website. Further detail on infrastructure provision is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	In circumstances where government policy does not facilitate this funding, the Council should carry out its own Financial Appraisal of likely infrastructure costs, and include strong	None stated.	Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy (to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development) and the appraisal of infrastructure need and requirements in the Borough	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				policies and requirements for any land purchaser or developer. Thereby windfall profit would be reduced to more realistic levels and infrastructure funding secured.		can be found in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, available on its website. Further detail on infrastructure provision is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
478	Steve	Cardis	General	In circumstances where government policy does not facilitate this funding, the Council should carry out its own Financial Appraisal of likely infrastructure costs, and include strong policies and requirements for any land purchaser or developer. Thereby windfall profit would be reduced to more realistic levels and infrastructure funding secured.	None stated.	Developers are required to contribute to infrastructure delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy (to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development) and the appraisal of infrastructure need and requirements in the Borough can be found in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, available on its website. Further detail on infrastructure provision is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	One way to achieve delivery of housing suitable for Woking residents' requirements is for the Council and its partners to secure one of the Pyrford sites. This would help young people secure homes at affordable prices, and is more likely to secure public support.	The Council and its partners should secure one of the Pyrford sites to deliver housing to meet the needs of Woking residents.	Development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including young people. This would be in accordance with relevant Core Strategy policies (CS11 and CS12). Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the local housing needs mentioned.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	One way to achieve delivery of housing suitable for Woking residents' requirements is for the Council and its partners to secure one of the Pyrford sites. This would help young people secure homes at affordable prices, and is more likely to secure public support.	The Council and its partners should secure one of the Pyrford sites to deliver housing to meet the needs of Woking residents.	Development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including young people. This would be in accordance with relevant Core Strategy policies (CS11 and CS12). Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the local housing needs mentioned.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	The loss of Green Belt land raises significant issues and should only be released if an exceptional circumstance can be justified. This does not include speculative market housing that fails to meet local housing priorities and needs of young people in particular.	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. In addition, these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including young people. Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the housing priorities mentioned.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	The loss of Green Belt land raises significant issues and should only be released if an exceptional circumstance can be justified. This does not include speculative market housing that fails to meet local housing priorities and needs of young people in particular.	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. In addition, development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including young people. Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the housing priorities mentioned.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	General	The loss of Green Belt land raises significant issues and should only be released if an exceptional circumstance can be justified. This does not include speculative market housing that fails to meet local housing priorities and needs of young people in particular.	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. In addition, development at these sites would include a mix of housing, including affordable housing (as listed in the allocation's key requirements) to help meet the needs of the local population, including young people. Without development such as this, there would be far less potential for the Council to address the housing priorities mentioned.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB12	With respect to exceptional circumstances, the Council needs to establish why no other sites are available in a robust way.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	GB13	With respect to exceptional circumstances, the Council needs to establish why no other sites are available in a robust way.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
478	Steve	Cardis	General	With respect to exceptional circumstances, the Council needs to establish why no other sites are available in a	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 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
				robust way.			of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB4	The Council's highway maintenance department are incapable of maintaining a good service at present with regard to pedestrian controlled traffic lights and potholes.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Broad oaks 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, including mitigation of traffic impacts arising from the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB5	The Council's highway maintenance department are incapable of maintaining a good service at present with regard to pedestrian controlled traffic lights and potholes.	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. Maintenance of road is dealt with by the Highways Authority (Surrey County Council - any complaints in this regard should be made to them) and is not directly linked to planning.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	General	The Council's highway maintenance department are incapable of maintaining a good service at present with regard to pedestrian controlled traffic lights and potholes.	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. Maintenance of road is dealt with by the Highways Authority (Surrey County Council - any complaints in this regard should be made to them) and is not directly linked to planning.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB4	The roads in Byfleet are already gridlocked at various times in the day, and a 900 place school and housing will worsen this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Broad oaks 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, including mitigation of traffic impacts arising from the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB5	The road in Byfleet is already gridlocked at various times in the day, and a 900 place school and housing will worsen this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Broad oaks 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, including mitigation of traffic impacts arising from the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB16	The road in Byfleet is already gridlocked at various times in the day, and a 900 place school and housing will worsen this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Broad oaks 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, including mitigation of traffic impacts arising from the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB4	Construction will cause noise, environmental pollution and spoil the village atmosphere in Byfleet, with no Green Belt to enjoy.	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. 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 representation regarding village atmosphere has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB5	Construction will cause noise, environmental pollution and spoil the village atmosphere in Byfleet, with no Green Belt to enjoy.	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.  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	No further modification is 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>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>The representation regarding village atmosphere has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
590	J	Carey	GB4	Objects to building on Green Belt land prone to flooding. The more houses you build the higher the risk to original properties.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	GB5	Objects to building on Green Belt land prone to flooding. The more houses you build the higher the risk to original properties.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
590	J	Carey	General	Objects to building on Green Belt land prone to flooding. The more houses you build the higher the risk to original properties.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
807	Robert	Carey	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Too many houses without the supporting infrastructure. Green Belt provides an open rural character that is important to local people.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating this site or reducing the number of proposed dwellings on the site could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy or result in the Council having to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet housing need. 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. 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
807	Robert	Carey	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Too many houses without the supporting infrastructure. Green Belt provides an open rural character that is important to local people.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating this site or reducing the number of proposed dwellings on the site could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy or result in the Council having to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet housing need.</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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
807	Robert	Carey	GB12	The proposals will change the outlook and charm of our home. It will be an eye sore on this unspoilt and historic area of the borough.	None stated.	The representation regarding impact on landscape, heritage and character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
807	Robert	Carey	GB13	The proposals will change the outlook and charm of our home. It will be an eye sore on this unspoilt and historic area of the borough.	None stated.	The representation regarding impact on landscape, heritage and character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	General	There is no robust case for residential development in green-field sites in the Green Belt around Woking. All the required dwellings can be provided on brownfield sites either inside or outside of the Green Belt. The numbers that purport to show otherwise are conjecture compounded by conjecture and could easily be revised to show a whole range of different outcomes, particularly given the timescale when major factors such as membership of the EEC cannot be taken as givens.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section. See Sections 1 and 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB12	<p>The Draft Site Allocations DPD is in part based on the Peter Brett Green Belt Review, which as I pointed out to you in my comments dated 16 December 2014, was flawed in a number of respects. Those flaws include the following.</p> <p>Sites GB12 and GB13 were consistently assessed as not being suitable for release due to fulfilling two critical Green Belt purposes, with poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. Much of the evidence presented in the review undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion.</p> <p>Site GB13 was considered in the review as being particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' (Woking Local Plan 1999 Policy NE7, Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS24). GB13 was considered unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The review sieved out a number of sites based on Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors, including GB12 and GB13. It then reintroduced GB12 at the end of the process based on land availability and whether the sites have been previously promoted. These are not identified as criteria in the methodology, there are fundamental flaws in using availability/promotion as a key factor for determining areas suitable for release. It is wholly unreasonable in an area such as Woking where any half-decent site would be snapped up for residential development.</p> <p>The review does not provide any reasonable justification for reintroducing sites GB12 and GB13, particularly when there</p>	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Green Belt boundary review is robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10. The landscape implications of the proposals 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
				<p>are several alternative sites which have performed better in terms of their Green Belt suitability and/or sustainability credentials, notably Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28.</p> <p>The sites identified in the review have not all been subject to an equal and consistent assessment. Some have been broken down into sub-parcels and subjected to a more refined appraisal, while others have been identified as potentially suitable but are not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This cannot be a sound means of determining areas suitable for release over the plan period.</p>			
93	John	Carolin	GB13	<p>The Draft Site Allocations DPD is in part based on the Peter Brett Green Belt Review, which as I pointed out to you in my comments dated 16 December 2014, was flawed in a number of respects. Those flaws include the following. Sites GB12 and GB13 were consistently assessed as not being suitable for release due to fulfilling two critical Green Belt purposes, with poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. Much of the evidence presented in the review undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion. Site GB13 was considered in the review as being particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' (Woking Local Plan 1999 Policy NE7, Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS24). GB13 was considered unsuitable for residential development. The review sieved out a number of sites based on Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors, including GB12 and GB13. It then reintroduced GB12 at the end of the process based on land availability and whether the sites have been previously promoted. These are not identified as criteria in the methodology, there are fundamental flaws in using availability/promotion as a key factor for determining areas suitable for release. It is wholly unreasonable in an area such as Woking where any half-decent site would be snapped up for residential development. The review does not provide any reasonable justification for reintroducing sites GB12 and GB13, particularly when there are several alternative sites which have performed better in terms of their Green Belt suitability and/or sustainability credentials, notably Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28. The sites identified in the review have not all been subject to an equal and consistent assessment. Some have been broken down into sub-parcels and subjected to a more refined appraisal, while others have been identified as potentially suitable but are not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This cannot be a sound means of determining areas suitable for release over the plan period.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will require an archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB12	<p>National Planning policy framework (NPPF) Purpose 4 of the Green Belt 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' has been removed from the review as it was considered irrelevant to Woking. The assessment consistently neglected to consider important historic assets within the Borough. While Woking is not a historic town, historic assets should still be assessed in combination with other important local considerations relevant to the setting of Woking.</p>	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
93	John	Carolin	GB13	National Planning policy framework (NPPF) Purpose 4 of the Green Belt 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' has been removed from the review as it was considered irrelevant to Woking. The assessment consistently neglected to consider important historic assets within the Borough. While Woking is not a historic town, historic assets should still be assessed in combination with other important local considerations relevant to the setting of 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. 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
93	John	Carolin	GB12	Concern for landscape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive landscape features.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB13	Site GB12 is bound by mature tree and shrub belts which substantially screen the urban edge of Woking. All the trees in Site GB12 are covered by a Tree Protection Order. Site GB13 is open, sitting on top of the south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley and with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and beyond to the Surrey Hills AONB. Development will have an impact of the character of both GB12 and GB13 and could result in the loss sensitive landscape features.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB12	GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fields form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village.	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 landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB13	Sites GB12 and GB13 together with the adjoining woodland and fields form a relatively narrow tract of land that provides a continuous stretch of uninterrupted countryside between the town and river valley. This countryside is curtailed by surrounding golf courses, formal man-made features in the landscape of distinctly different character, comprising artificial land forms, fairways and bunkers. Sites GB12 and GB13 play an important role in containing the southern edge of Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village of Pyrford. Sites GB12 and GB13 also form part of a rare example in this area of Surrey of an area of rural landscape that has not been lost and degraded by golf course blight.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB12	Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development, surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village it could erode the rural setting of the village.	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 landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB13	This countryside contains a number of important heritage assets which development on GB12 and GB13 could cause adverse impacts to. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development would erode the landscape around Pyrford Court. The sites form part of the land surrounding Pyrford Conservation Area; analysis of the historic maps illustrate the surrounding fields were once farmed by the residents of Pyrford. Development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village but it could erode the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB12	Development would have adverse impact on: Pyrford Court Registered Park and Garden and Listed Buildings, a number of grade II listed buildings; the Pyrford Area, its surrounding agricultural landscape and several farms judged to form part of its setting, including eastwards along Warren Lane to incorporate (grade II Wheelers Farm and Barn); the 1480's well preserved listed Wheelers Farmhouse and outbuildings together with the adjoining 300/400 year old Barn; and the building at Key Lees.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB13	Development would have adverse impact on: Pyrford Court Registered Park and Garden and Listed Buildings, a number of grade II listed buildings; the Pyrford Area, its surrounding agricultural landscape and several farms judged to form part of its setting, including eastwards along Warren Lane to incorporate (grade II Wheelers Farm and Barn); the 1480's well preserved listed Wheelers Farmhouse and outbuildings together with the adjoining 300/400 year old Barn; and the building at Key Lees.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB12	<p>The B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction is already busy with traffic and is an accident cluster. There may be issues with the design, layout or condition of the local highway network. Access into Site GB12 from Upshot Lane would be problematic due to the existing, dense, tree line/hedgerow that borders the site. A large amount of tree clearance and land take would be needed, which would reduce overall capacity and/or cause inappropriate development. Site GB12 could also be accessed from the B367 Pyrford Common Road but this would result in substantial tree loss and direct vehicular access onto trunk road is not desirable.</p> <p>Any roundabout at the priority junction would require a very large diameter, resulting in significant tree loss and landscape/heritage impacts. The area is considered to be of archaeological importance. Pedestrian access to Sites GB12 and GB13 is problematic due to the lack of existing footway provision and speed of traffic along the local road.</p>	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB13	<p>The B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction is already busy with traffic and is an accident cluster. There may be issues with the design, layout or condition of the local highway network. Access into Site GB12 from Upshot Lane would be problematic due to the existing, dense, tree line/hedgerow that borders the site. A large amount of tree clearance and land take would be needed, which would reduce overall capacity and/or cause inappropriate development. Site GB12 could also be accessed from the B367 Pyrford Common Road but this would result in substantial tree loss and direct vehicular access onto trunk road is not desirable.</p> <p>Any roundabout at the priority junction would require a very large diameter, resulting in significant tree loss and landscape/heritage impacts. The area is considered to be of archaeological importance. Pedestrian access to Sites GB12 and GB13 is problematic due to the lack of existing footway provision and speed of traffic along the local road.</p>	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
93	John	Carolin	GB12	Sites GB12 and GB13 are remote from the railway system. Without reasonable access to West Byfleet Station or	None stated.	The sustainability of the sites, in particular, their relationship to the neighbourhood centre has been assessed as part of either the Sustainability Appraisal or the Green Belt boundary review.	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
				Woking station most journeys will be made by car, including to station carparks. This will create further traffic congestion particularly in pinch points in Pyrford village. Efforts to relieve these would be self-defeating because it would only encourage further through-traffic volume to take advantage of improved flows.		The sites can be sustainably developed. The traffic implications of the proposals 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 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 issue 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 issues of the area.	of this representation
93	John	Carolin	GB13	Sites GB12 and GB13 are remote from the railway system. Without reasonable access to West Byfleet Station or Woking station most journeys will be made by car, including to station carparks. This will create further traffic congestion particularly in pinch points in Pyrford village. Efforts to relieve these would be self-defeating because it would only encourage further through-traffic volume to take advantage of improved flows.	None stated.	The sustainability of the sites, in particular, their relationship to the neighbourhood centre has been assessed as part of either the Sustainability Appraisal or the Green Belt boundary review. The sites can be sustainably developed. The traffic implications of the proposals 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 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 issue 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
94	John	Carolin	General	<p>The Council says it is satisfied the Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) follows those recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review, to deliver the most sustainable pattern of development as required within the Core Strategy. However I am advised that there are conflicts between the SA and Green Belt Review conclusions. This raises a number of obvious concerns including the following. Site GB13 was not considered as suitable for release from the Green Belt in the Green Belt Review, yet it is identified as a preferred site in the SA. The Council considered that the capacity of sites recommended for release in the Green Belt Review was not sufficient to meet the 2040 housing land supply targets. As a result, the Council has included site GB13 as a safeguarded site based on the SA recommendation, despite consistently being identified as unsuitable in the Green Belt Review and removed from consideration in Stage 2 of the assessment. Parcel 7 is rejected from the SA as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative, contrary to the Green Belt Review's recommendation that it could be considered as a safeguarded site if other parcels cannot provide sufficient quantum of development for the plan period and beyond to 2040. The SA does not only assess sites recommended in the Green Belt Review report for development. It is a separate and distinct evidence base that assesses all other reasonable alternative sites promoted and identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Employment Land Review and Topic Paper in equal detail. However, the SA does not assess any sites within Parcel 31, which in the ranking order of Parcels within the Green Belt Review, is considered more suitable than Parcel 9.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD is informed by a multiple number of evidence base studies. It is true that parcel 7 is recommended in the Green Belt boundary to be released for development. Based on further information relating to flooding the Council has decided that this parcel of land should not be allocated. The reasons for the Council's decision are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. It is also true that the Green Belt boundary review report did not recommend the allocation of site GB13. The further work of Sustainability Appraisal supports the allocation of the site. Overall the Council has to balance a number of information to inform its decision on each of the preferred sites. This is not an unreasonable approach to take.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
94	John	Carolin	General	<p>There are conflicts between the Core Strategy objectives and SA objectives, as a result of the need to protect the purpose of the Green Belt whilst identifying sufficient sites to deliver the unmet housing need. The SA only partially relies on the Green Belt Review. The Council has come to its own decisions on site allocation and suitability ranking, without any further evidence base to justify this decision. The SA cannot be said to form a robust evidence base.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD draws directly on the Green Belt Review and the SA, rather than utilising the key document, the SA. The SA in itself has already discounted certain sites and conclusions reached within the Green Belt Review. It is therefore inconsistent to reintroduce this document and conclusions already discounted back into the Site Allocations DPD process. The Site Allocations DPD alternates between the Green Belt Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process. Stage 2 utilises the Green Belt Review, whilst stage 3 utilises the SA. This creates an unsound evidence base and inconsistency in the assessment methodology process.</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 Section 1. The Core Strategy commits the Council to carry out a Green Belt boundary review to inform decisions about sites to be released to meet future development needs between 2022 and 2027. The SA has been carried out to assess the environmental, social and economic implications for the proposed allocations. The Council has to rely on a range of evidence base studies to inform its decision on preferred sites. The list of the evidence base is included in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD. The methodology used to carry out the studies are explained in the studies. The reasons for excluding some sites for assessment because they fall within absolute constraints have been explained. On balance, the Council is satisfied that the evidence generally supports the sites proposed for allocation.</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
800	Susan	Carolin	GB12	This provides Woking's remaining agricultural land. Pyrford has a long history of farming. It would provide food security for the future. The GBBR did not take this into account.	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. 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.</p> <p>It is incorrect that the Green Belt boundary review did not take into account agricultural land classification. This assessment was part of Stage 2 of the site selection process. In addition it was also considered by the Council during the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolin	GB13	This provides Woking's remaining agricultural land. Pyrford has a long history of farming. It would provide food security for the future. The GBBR did not take this into account.	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. 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. It is incorrect that the Green Belt boundary review did not take into account agricultural land classification. This assessment was part of Stage 2 of the site selection process. In addition it was also considered by the Council during the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolin	GB12	Background air quality is not considered despite it having an impact on air quality across the region. See page 17 of the Habitats Regulation Assessment. With European designated protection areas in the local area, the impact of increased population on the M25 and A3 should be considered. Air pollution will also have health impacts on local residents.	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>Regarding the impact of air pollution and the proposed developments on wildlife, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England. 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
800	Susan	Carolin	GB13	Background air quality is not considered despite it having an impact on air quality across the region. See page 17 of the Habitats Regulation Assessment. With European designated protection areas in the local area, the impact of increased population on the M25 and A3 should be considered. Air pollution will also have health impacts on local residents.	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. Regarding the impact of air pollution and the proposed developments on wildlife, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	Farmland bird were commonly seen on the site and could return if farmland practices were to change. It would also improve wider biodiversity. If developed, this would not be able to take place.	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 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 draft allocation notes within the key requirements that biodiversity improvements must be introduced to the scheme, including wildlife features and corridors. The key requirements also note that mature trees and existing vegetation should be retained as well as take opportunities to make positive contributions towards biodiversity through the creation of alternative green spaces, retention/enhancement of any features of nature conservation value on-site, and creation of linkages with the Green Infrastructure network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB13	Farmland bird were commonly seen on the site and could return if farmland practices were to change. It would also improve wider biodiversity. If developed, this would not be able to take place.	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 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 draft allocation notes within the key requirements that biodiversity improvements must be introduced to the scheme, including wildlife features and corridors. The key requirements also note that mature trees and existing vegetation should be retained as well as take opportunities to make positive contributions towards biodiversity through the creation of alternative green spaces, retention/enhancement of any features of nature conservation value on-site, and creation of linkages with the Green Infrastructure network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. This includes proposed developments at Wisley Airfield. The Strategic Transport Assessment highlights that traffic flows will reach unacceptable levels with the developments taking place. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose these developments with the knowledge of the traffic problems it will generate.	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, taking into account developments within and outside of the Borough. A Duty to Cooperate statement 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
						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.	
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. This includes proposed developments at Wisley Airfield. The Strategic Transport Assessment highlights that traffic flows will reach unacceptable levels with the developments taking place. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose these developments with the knowledge of the traffic problems it will generate.	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, taking into account developments 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The government attached great importance to Green Belt. States the aims of Green Belt policy. The proposal will contradict CS1 of the Core Strategy and the GBBR based on landscape character. Not acceptable for the Council to ignore residents and the GBBR and to refuse to discuss the proposals which are based on a faulty process.	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development and whether the Council's approach is consistent with the NPPF is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>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> <p>The Council's evidence base for the Site Allocations DPD is clearly set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. This includes a Landscape Character Assessment. The Council's response to the impact of the site allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council considers its approach to be consistent with National Planning Policy (NPPF) as well as the Development Plan for the area, including Core Strategy Policy CS1.</p> <p>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 Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	The site enjoys a unique landscape character that can not be replaced. It has been used by locals for many years for leisure and recreation. The landscape adjacent to the site makes up the heritage of the village and the proposals will destroy this heritage landscape. The farmland is still used for agriculture and the last remaining farm in the borough. The sites openness and unspoilt character are assets of the area. It is adjacent to Pyrford Common and therefore part of a	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, 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 landscape 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 key requirements for the site note that there is an opportunity to form pedestrian and cycle ways through the development as well as improve provision of and connectivity to existing informal and formal recreation space. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve 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
				wider landscape area. The urban area should not be allowed to encroach into it.		enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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.	
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB13	<p>The site has a unique landscape character. It also used to provide a publicly accessible footpath. There are adjacent heritage assets/landscape that would be destroyed.</p> <p>The farmland is still being used for production and this unspoilt landscape would be lost forever.</p> <p>The site is also adjacent to a natural landscape of Pyrford Common.</p> <p>This is an asset for the whole of Woking and the urban area should not be allowed to encroach into it.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, 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 landscape 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>The key requirements for the site note that there is an opportunity to form pedestrian and cycle ways through the development as well as improve provision of and connectivity to existing informal and formal recreation space.</p> <p>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>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	<p>WBC have not followed the correct procedure in identifying site GB12 for Safeguarding. The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and the GBBR have raised concerns and not been taken into account but instead those of landowners and developers. The GBBR stated that it had low suitability for removal but is less sensitive in landscape terms. This is incorrect as it is a Rising Ground of Landscape Importance with extensive views, green corridors and is part of the setting of Pyrford Court. The land to the north of Tags Lane is an important community asset as it is used as parking for the Flower Show. It is also used by local groups and could be developed for use as a recreational facility. The Council's evidence is faulty and will be to the detriment of the community and landscape. Only a small part of Parcel 9 was noted as being sustainable rather than suitable.</p>	None stated.	<p>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 Representor ID 19. The representation regarding the methodology of the Green belt boundary review and the Council's decisions for allocating sites in the draft Site Allocations DPD has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0. The Green Belt boundary review is a technical document that does not set policy. It is an evidence base document and therefore, in line with National Planning Policy and legislation, does not need to be consulted with the wider public. Nevertheless the document has been published on the Council's website for consideration since early 2014. The representation regarding landscape character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB13	<p>The Borough has not followed a correct procedure in arriving at the field GB12 to be safeguarded for future development between 2027 and 2040. Site noted in GBBR as having very low suitability for removal from the Green Belt, serving two critical Green Belt purposes and being fundamental to the Green Belt. Site was only included in the SA DPD to cushion in case of a shortfall in numbers. This goes against government policy that states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. The NPPF is clear that Green Belt land should be retained as they prevent sprawl and maintain openness.</p>	None stated.	<p>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 Representor ID 19.</p> <p>The representation regarding the methodology of the Green belt boundary review and the Council's decisions for allocating sites in the draft Site Allocations DPD has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review is a technical document that does not set policy. It is an evidence base document and therefore, in line with National Planning Policy and legislation, does not need to be consulted with the wider public. Nevertheless the document has been published on the Council's website for consideration since early 2014.</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 representation regarding landscape character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development, safeguarding land for future development needs and consistency of the DPD with the NPPF has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	
800	Susan	Carolin	GB12	Preschool, nursery and school places are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The rebuild of Pyrford Primary School does not take into account the proposed increase in population. The medical facilities are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolin	GB13	Preschool, nursery and school places are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The rebuild of Pyrford Primary School does not take into account the proposed increase in population. The medical facilities are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolin	GB13	The proposal will contradict CS1 of the Core Strategy and the GBBR based on landscape character. Not acceptable for the Council to ignore residents and the GBBR and to refuse to discuss the proposals which are based on a faulty process.	None stated.	<p>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> <p>The Council's evidence base for the Site Allocations DPD is clearly set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. This includes a Landscape Character Assessment. The Council's response to the impact of the site allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council considers its approach to be consistent with National Planning Policy (NPPF) as well as the Development Plan for the area, including Core Strategy Policy CS1.</p> <p>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 Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
800	Susan	Carolin	GB13	There are other government policies in place to deliver more homes, including the new London brownfield land database. New homes in Pyrford would not be affordable due to the desirability of the area and high land values. More sensible to retain the quality of life for people in Pyrford and West Byfleet then build more houses here. Other brownfield sites should be considered, perhaps not in Woking but in other areas of the South East. Retaining Green Belt that clearly serves the purpose of preventing urban sprawl should be the aim of the Council. Building on green fields will be to the detriment of all.	GB13 should not be 'safeguarded' for future development but should be retained in the green belt.	<p>The Council notes the potential future changes to national planning policy. Registers such as the Brownfield land database for London and London Housing Zones are programmes in place to meet the housing need of London, not Woking. In Woking, as evidenced by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, there is a demand for 594 dwellings per year. Based on the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed at the Core Strategy Examination that an average annual target of 292 was both achievable and sustainable. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide, amongst other things, the homes needed by local people. Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. 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 notes the comment</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
						regarding developing other areas in the South East. As stated above, the Council is fully committed to facilitating the delivery of both private and affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet the local housing need. By restricting development in the Borough it would further increase the level of housing demand in the Borough, have a negative impact on affordability and be against national planning policy and the governments' commitment to national house building. 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. 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.	
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	Changes to government policy could affect the need for housing in Woking, including the London brownfield register. Difficult to believe that genuinely affordable housing could be developed in Pyrford due to costs and the desirability of the area. The constraints on growth locally are known and it would be better to retain the quality of life for existing residents and character of the area. There are brownfield sites available in other areas of the South East. The Green Belt serves the purpose of preventing sprawl and the quick fix of building on it will be to the detriment of all.	GB12 should not be 'safeguarded' for future development but should be retained in the green belt.	The Council notes the potential future changes to national planning policy. Registers such as the Brownfield land database for London and London Housing Zones are programmes in place to meet the housing need of London, not Woking. In Woking, as evidenced by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, there is a demand for 594 dwellings per year. Based on the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed at the Core Strategy Examination that an average annual target of 292 was both achievable and sustainable. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide, amongst other things, the homes needed by local people. Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. 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 notes the comment regarding developing other areas in the South East. As stated above, the Council is fully committed to facilitating the delivery of both private and affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet the local housing need. By restricting development in the Borough it would further increase the level of housing demand in the Borough, have a negative impact on affordability and be against national planning policy and the government's commitment to national house building. 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. 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
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB12	The South East is an area of high water stress and the sewage systems are only adequate until 2026. There is no evidence to show that the systems will cope with additional demand. It is irresponsible to build houses without this knowledge.	None stated.	This representation 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
800	Susan	Carolyn	GB13	The South East is an area of high water stress and the sewage systems are only adequate until 2026. There is no evidence to show that the systems will cope with additional demand. It is irresponsible to build houses without this knowledge.	None stated.	This representation 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
1192	Graeme	Carter	GB15	550+ houses on this site, and developments in GB16 and GB4, will result in a large volume of additional traffic onto an already congested road. School places and GP are stretched, the Broad oaks school will not necessarily serve the local community. Pupils from outside the area will add to traffic. Private school does not align with 50% affordable housing provision in development. The site is the single largest proposed; the housing requirement is not being spread, easier if each location had smaller increases to absorb into existing infrastructure.	Any housing on GB16 or GB15 need to become part of the West Byfleet community. There would need to be consideration to	The issue about the necessary infrastructure to support the development is comprehensive addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					pedestrians accessing West Byfleetcentre if these residents are forced to drive then WestByfleet is unlikely to be their destination given the limited parking available locally. This would limit these residents becoming part of the community.		
1192	Graeme	Carter	15 Sustainability Appraisal findings	The sustainability appraisal report is contradictory when referring to site GB15's proximity to West Byfleet District Centre.	Consistency across the answers to the separate findings is required to know what solutions are required. If the route is walkable, what provisions are to be made to improve the walking? What provision is to be made for road crossings? Traffic lights will compound the problems in the area. Is a footbridge required? Are the existing pavements adequate/wide enough? Is there room to widen these pathways?	The manner in which the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform the selection of preferred sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9. The SA uses a standard framework that is objective led to ensure that all sites are assessed against a set criteria. The decision aiding questions also ensure that the criteria is applied consistently. There is no doubt that site GB15 is within reasonable walking and cycling distance to the West Byfleet District Centre. It is there in a sustainable location by reason of its proximity to key services and facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1192	Graeme	Carter	General	The documents are huge in volume, how are we to have a view on these developments? The findings whitewash any thought of solving the issue raised for example the flood plain. It's just	None stated.	Appendix 1 of the DPD is a list of the evidence base studies used to support the DPD. The representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8. The Council is satisfied that the evidence is robust enough to inform decision on preferred sites to be 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
				words, there are no real evidence of solutions or ideas in these documents on what or how it will be done.			
1192	Graeme	Carter	GB16	This derelict site requires redevelopment. Need to consider traffic and junctions. The private school will not cater for local residents. The proposal notes woodland to the west however this is proposed to be removed by GB15, resulting in one large residential space without woodland and 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. 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
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Any large scale development will negatively effect the village in terms of its character and charm, sense of community; its place in the natural landscape, pleasant environment and accessibility to the countryside. One destroyed this cannot be regained.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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 (see Section 23.0 of that paper). 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, and also look at opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Any large scale development will negatively effect the village in terms of its character and charm, sense of community; its place in the natural landscape, pleasant environment and accessibility to the countryside. One destroyed this cannot be regained.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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 (see Section 23.0 of that paper). 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, and also look at opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Building more houses will not solve the perceived housing shortage, but will increase the population of the area and mean more houses will be needed. The answer is diversification and encouraging economic growth away from London.	Encourages diversification and economic growth away from London.	Point noted, however this is an issue for a wider, strategic policy debate at a national level of governance. The draft Site Allocations are taking forward the development requirements of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, as outlined in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Building more houses will not solve the perceived housing shortage, but will increase the population of the area and mean more houses will be needed. The answer is diversification and encouraging economic growth away from London.	Encourages diversification and economic growth away from London.	Point noted, however this is an issue for a wider, strategic policy debate at a national level of governance. The draft Site Allocations are taking forward the development requirements of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, as outlined in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Adjacent borough Councils are examining large scale developments including Wisley Airfield and others. This will lead to increased traffic passing through the village and associated noise pollution and vehicle emissions.	None stated.	It is not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Adjacent borough Councils are examining large scale developments including Wisley Airfield and others. This will lead to increased traffic passing through the village and associated noise pollution and vehicle emissions.	None stated.	It is not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Considers the increased traffic a serious safety issue, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. Development and more people will exacerbate this.	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 County Council will be made aware of traffic enforcement and safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Considers the increased traffic a serious safety issue, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. Development and more people will exacerbate this.	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 County Council will be made aware of traffic enforcement and safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Does not support any plans to develop the area.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Does not support any plans to develop the area.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Sustainable development' is a myth, once an area has been developed it will never return to what it was before.	None stated.	Point noted, however it does not take account for the development requirements set out in the Council's Core Strategy (see Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) which these sites are helping to deliver, or the duty for local Councils to help provide for local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Sustainable development' is a myth, once an area has been developed it will never return to what it was before.	None stated.	Point noted, however it does not take account for the development requirements set out in the Council's Core Strategy (see Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) which these sites are helping to deliver, or the duty for local Councils to help provide for local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	Pyrford is subject to creeping urbanisation where single property plots have been intensified to two or more dwellings. Oakfield school is being re-developed into a multi-dwelling estate.	None stated.	The 'creeping' urbanisation referred to shows intensification, or infill, and change of use development within existing urban areas and local centres. This is generally supported (with regard to other Development Plan policies) by the Council's strategy for housing provision, as outlined in Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB12	Pyrford is subject to creeping urbanisation where single property plots have been intensified to two or more dwellings. Oakfield school is being re-developed into a multi-dwelling estate.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
459	J	Caruth	GB12	The proposed development conflicts with the purpose and principles of the Green Belt, to contain urbanisation and loss of rural landscapes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
459	J	Caruth	GB13	The proposed development conflicts with the purpose and principles of the Green Belt, to contain urbanisation and loss of rural landscapes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB12	Pyrford is already congested around the school and shops. Building would make things worse, also the need for more school places. Likely major housing in Guildford Borough at Wisley Airfield and elsewhere could increase traffic passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet Station and centre. Noise, pollution and congestion are already problematic in Old Woking Road.	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 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 these 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 issues of the area.	
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB13	Pyrford is already congested around the school and shops. Building would make things worse, also the need for more school places. Likely major housing in Guildford Borough at Wisley Airfield and elsewhere could increase traffic passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet Station and centre. Noise, pollution and congestion are already problematic in Old Woking Road.	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 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 these 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 issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB15	Pyrford is already congested around the school and shops. Building would make things worse, also the need for more school places. Likely major housing in Guildford Borough at Wisley Airfield and elsewhere could increase traffic passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet Station and centre. Noise, pollution and congestion are already problematic in Old Woking Road.	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 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 these 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	No further modification is 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 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 issues of the area.	
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB12	Understand development must take place but building 433 houses, probably unaffordable for most young people, is not the way to proceed. Build fewer houses with a high percentage of affordable accommodation and suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens.	None stated.	The Council has policies such as Policies CS12 and Cs13 of the Core Strategy to secure part of residential development as affordable homes and to support the provision of home to meet the need of the elderly population. Nevertheless, 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
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB13	Understand development must take place but building 433 houses, probably unaffordable for most young people, is not the way to proceed. Build fewer houses with a high percentage of affordable accommodation and suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens.	None stated.	The Council will make sure that development proposals meet the Affordable Housing requirements of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. Policy CS13 also offers an in-principle support for elderly people accommodation. Having said that the proposals are needed to meet the identified needs of the area. The proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives considered. The Council will make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall character of the Green Belt. 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
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB15	Understand development must take place but building 433 houses, probably unaffordable for most young people, is not the way to proceed. Build fewer houses with a high percentage of affordable accommodation and suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens.	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 an Affordable Housing policy CS12 of the Core Strategy to make sure that a proportion of housing development is affordable homes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB12	I object to housing in Pyrford/West Byfleet 2015 - 2040. Development in Pyrford would endanger heritage views from Pyrford Escarpment to the North Downs. Removal of these fields was not recommended by the Green Belt Review and would change the nature of the village. Surrounding green landscape and footpaths are important to character and an asset.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB13	I object to housing in Pyrford/West Byfleet 2015 - 2040. Development in Pyrford would endanger heritage views from Pyrford Escarpment to the North Downs. Removal of these fields was not recommended by the Green Belt Review and would change the nature of the village. Surrounding green landscape and footpaths are important to character and an asset.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
1083	Angela	Cassidy	GB15	I object to housing in Pyrford/West Byfleet 2015 - 2040. Development in Pyrford would endanger heritage views from Pyrford Escarpment to the North Downs. Removal of these fields was not recommended by the Green Belt Review and would change the nature of the village. Surrounding green landscape and footpaths are important to character and an asset.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Raises concern about how local residents and letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and LDA Design have been ignored over these issues that are vital to the community. Asks why the Council has approved the draft DPD without taking account of full representations received?	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Raises concern about how local residents and letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and LDA Design have been ignored over these issues that are vital to the community. Asks why the Council has approved the draft DPD without taking account of full representations received?	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Whilst understanding the pressure to create new housing, and the current shortage, there is a responsibility to respect and protect our environment. This should be carefully considered in light of the views of residents who care deeply about our community and environment.	None stated.	These considerations are noted, but overall these sites are considered to be the most sustainable options for future development. This is detailed further in Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, and a general justification for development of Green Belt sites can be found in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Whilst understanding the pressure to create new housing, and the current shortage, there is a responsibility to respect and protect our environment. This should be carefully considered in light of the views of residents who care deeply about our community and environment.	None stated.	These considerations are noted, but overall these sites are considered to be the most sustainable options for future development. This is detailed further in Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, and a general justification for development of Green Belt sites can be found in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Objects to the proposal due to the importance of Green Belt to the living environment and quality of life, as a key reason for buying in the area. The proposals would destroy a significant proportion of green space, and have a substantial impact on the charm and character of Pyrford. Pyrford is an area of unspoilt beauty, and the unique atmosphere of the village would change if urban development goes ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Objects to the proposal due to the importance of Green Belt to the living environment and quality of life, as a key reason for buying in the area. The proposals would destroy a significant proportion of green space, and have a substantial impact on the charm and character of Pyrford. Pyrford is an area of unspoilt beauty, and the unique atmosphere of the village would change if urban development goes ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	The proposals contradict current government policy and will not prevent the sprawl of built up areas, safeguard the countryside from encroachment or preserve the setting and special character of Pyrford and other villages in the area. Once Green Belts are defined local authorities should plan to positively enhance their beneficial use, and once Green Belt is established, new sites are unlikely to gain approval except in exceptional circumstances. This area of rural landscape forms as partition between Woking and Pyrford and prevents towns merging and the sprawl of large built-up areas.	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. Landscape issues are addressed in Section 7.0 of this paper, and urban sprawl in Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	The proposals contradict current government policy and will not prevent the sprawl of built up areas, safeguard the countryside from encroachment or preserve the setting and special character of Pyrford and other villages in the area. Once Green Belts are defined local authorities should plan to positively enhance their beneficial use, and once Green Belt is established, new sites are unlikely to gain approval except in exceptional circumstances. This area of rural landscape forms as partition between Woking and Pyrford and prevents towns merging and the sprawl of large built-up areas.	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. Landscape issues are addressed in Section 7.0 of this paper, and urban sprawl in Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Development will lead to less opportunity to easily access and enjoy the countryside for recreation and sport, for current and future generations	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. Further to this, the key requirements of the site state it must provide open space and include improved or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Development will lead to less opportunity to easily access and enjoy the countryside for recreation and sport, for	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. Further to this, the key requirements of the site state it must	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
				current and future generations		provide open space and include improved or new green infrastructure.	of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Raises concern about the Green Belt Review, and the site's continual assessment as not being suitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes. The review further assesses these sites as unsuitable for residential development based on a combination of Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors. It then seems that GB12 is considered due to land availability, which should not be a key factor in deciding the suitability of a proposed site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Raises concern about the Green Belt Review, and the site's continual assessment as not being suitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes. GB13 was deemed particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed nature of the site and its designation as an 'Escarpment of Rising Ground of landscape Importance' as per Policy CS24, and therefore unsuitable for development. The review further assesses these sites as unsuitable for residential development based on a combination of Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors. It then seems that GB12 is considered due to land availability, which should not be a key factor in deciding the suitability of a proposed site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	Raises concern about the ability of local infrastructure to cope with an increased population, particularly in terms of: the limited rail service capacity from West Byfleet; existing traffic congestion on local road; the capacity of an expanded (construction about to begin) Pyrford school and lack of available places in other local schools; and also availability of other services such as doctors. Asks the Council how it plans to deal with increased demand in school places?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0, and for school places, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected 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
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	Raises concern about the ability of local infrastructure to cope with an increased population, particularly in terms of: the limited rail service capacity from West Byfleet; existing traffic congestion on local road; the capacity of an expanded (construction about to begin) Pyrford school and lack of available places in other local schools; and also availability of other services such as doctors. Asks the Council how it plans to deal with increased demand in school places?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure, traffic and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 24.0, and for school places, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected 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
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB12	The development would lead to significant negative environmental impact, due to the amount of tree clearing that would be necessary and the effect on fauna, including deer.	None stated.	Both sites GB12 and GB13 include key requirements to maintain trees, tree belt and have regard to their landscape. Landscape issues are addressed in more detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. With regard to wildlife, 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
1420	Jonathan	Cassidy	GB13	The development would lead to significant negative environmental impact, due to the amount of tree clearing that would be necessary and the effect on fauna, including deer. The elevated position of GB13 would completely change the	None stated.	Both sites GB12 and GB13 include key requirements to maintain trees, tree belt and have regard to their landscape. Landscape issues are addressed in more detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. With regard to wildlife, 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				landscape.		<p>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. 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>	
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 test 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. This 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				or contribute to existing character.	by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 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. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground.	No further modification is 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 Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is clear that the land Egley is allocated for a school and residential. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB11	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to 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 fields either side later on	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB8	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to 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 fields either side later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The school now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB9	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to 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 fields either side later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The school now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>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.</p>		<p>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. 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.</p>	
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB10	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. 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.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB11	<p>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</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 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.</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
				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.			
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 road 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 road 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 road 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1120	Shirley	Castle	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 issue 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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. 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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. 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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1120	Shirley	Castle	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
1120	Shirley	Castle	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 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
548	Tony	Catley	GB10	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. The current proposal will do the opposite, in building on so much of the open land separating Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	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
548	Tony	Catley	GB11	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. The current proposal will do the opposite, in building on so much of the open land separating Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	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
548	Tony	Catley	GB14	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. The current proposal will do the opposite, in building on so much of the open land separating Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
548	Tony	Catley	GB10	Local transport infrastructure is already heavily congested at peak times and the additional traffic from new development will worsen this.	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
548	Tony	Catley	GB11	Local transport infrastructure is already heavily congested at peak times and the additional traffic from new development will worsen this.	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
548	Tony	Catley	GB14	Local transport infrastructure is already heavily congested at peak times and the additional traffic from new development will worsen this.	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
548	Tony	Catley	GB10	Objects to release of Green Belt and suggests the land should be classified as public green open space instead.	Classify the site as public green open space instead of building on it.	The Council notes the objection and the proposed modification. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
548	Tony	Catley	GB11	Objects to release of Green Belt and suggests the land should be classified as public green open space instead.	Classify the site as public green open space instead of building on it.	The Council notes the objection and the proposed modification. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
548	Tony	Catley	GB14	Objects to release of Green Belt and suggests the land should be classified as public green open space instead.	Classify the site as public green open space instead of building on it.	The Council notes the objection and the proposed modification. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
548	Tony	Catley	GB10	The proposed housing densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) are grossly excessive when compared to those in Hook Heath (5.5dph) and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area. This will lead to a downgraded environment on all levels, particularly in terms of air quality and noise, if plans go ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. 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 noise and air pollution. There are further policies on Noise, Light and Air Pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, due for examinations in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
548	Tony	Catley	GB11	The proposed housing densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) are grossly excessive when compared to those in Hook Heath (5.5dph) and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area. This will lead to a downgraded environment on all levels, particularly in terms of air quality and noise, if plans go ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. 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 noise and air pollution. There are further policies on Noise, Light and Air Pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, due for examinations in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
548	Tony	Catley	GB14	The proposed housing densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) are grossly excessive when compared to those in Hook Heath (5.5dph) and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area. This will lead to a downgraded environment on all levels, particularly in terms of air quality and noise, if plans go ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. 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 noise and air pollution. There are further policies on Noise, Light and Air Pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, due for examinations in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1505	Anne	Catley	GB10	Urges the Council to reconsider these plans, classify the land as publicly accessible open green space and safeguard it from development in the immediate and longer term.	Classify the land as publicly accessible open green space and safeguard it from development in the immediate and	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					longer term.		
1505	Anne	Catley	GB11	Urges the Council to reconsider these plans, classify the land as publicly accessible open green space and safeguard it from development in the immediate and longer term.	Classify the land as publicly accessible open green space and safeguard it from development in the immediate and longer term.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	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.	None stated.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	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.	None stated.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	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	In the absence of 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, these sites are considered suitable to safeguard to meet future development need. 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. Key requirements in the draft allocations themselves require open space, green infrastructure and suitable landscaping to be incorporated within the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1505	Anne	Catley	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	In the absence of 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, these sites are considered suitable to safeguard to meet future development need. 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. Key requirements in the draft allocations themselves require open space, green infrastructure and suitable landscaping to be incorporated within the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1505	Anne	Catley	GB10	Objects to the proposals on what is commonly referred to as The Escarpment. The sites should not have their Green Belt status removed but should be designated an area of publicly accessible green open space, in effect a natural country park.	The site should retain its Green Belt status and be designated as an area of publically accessible green space - a 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
1505	Anne	Catley	GB11	Objects to the proposals on what is commonly referred to as The Escarpment. The sites should not have their Green Belt status removed but should be designated an area of publicly accessible green open space, in effect a natural country park.	The site should retain its Green Belt status and be designated as an area of publically accessible green space - a 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1505	Anne	Catley	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 reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green space 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
1505	Anne	Catley	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 reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green space 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
1505	Anne	Catley	GB14	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 reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green space 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 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
1505	Anne	Catley	GB10	Children and grandchildren visit to enjoy the green spaces around Hook Heath. Please do not take them away.	None stated.	Comment noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1505	Anne	Catley	GB11	Children and grandchildren visit to enjoy the green spaces around Hook Heath. Please do not take them away.	None stated.	Comment noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1505	Anne	Catley	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 not for safeguarded sites (GB10, GB11 and GB14). Exceptional need for 1200 homes in the Green Belt is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence post 2027.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	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 not for safeguarded sites (GB10, GB11 and GB14). Exceptional need for 1200 homes in the Green Belt is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence post 2027.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	GB14	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 not for safeguarded sites (GB10, GB11 and GB14). Exceptional need for 1200 homes in the Green Belt is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence post 2027.	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
1505	Anne	Catley	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 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1505	Anne	Catley	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 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1505	Anne	Catley	GB14	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 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	GB should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Housing need does not justify harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	GB should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Housing need does not justify harm done to the GB 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	GB should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Housing need does not justify harm done to the GB 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	Development of these sites would increase the risk of surface water flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	Development of these sites would increase the risk of surface water flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	Development of these sites would increase the risk of surface water flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	GB10 and GB11 were historically included in the GB for its landscape credentials and specifically to stop this form of inappropriate development being proposed. The GBBR which supports the Site Allocation DPD is flawed and was not consulted on.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 7.0  In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	GB10 and GB11 were historically included in the GB for its landscape credentials and specifically to stop this form of inappropriate development being proposed. The GBBR which supports the Site Allocation DPD is flawed and was not consulted on.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 7.0  In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	GB10 and GB11 were historically included in the GB for its landscape credentials and specifically to stop this form of inappropriate development being proposed. The GBBR which supports the Site Allocation DPD is flawed and was not consulted on.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 7.0  In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	The proposals for the release of GB in Mayford would weaken not create a defensible Green Belt Boundary. Strong boundaries are prominent physical features e.g. escarpment, the proposal would result in the loss of an escarpment.	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. 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. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key	No further modification is 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 also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	The proposals for the release of GB in Mayford would weaken not create a defensible Green Belt Boundary. Strong boundaries are prominent physical features e.g. escarpment, the proposal would result in the loss of an escarpment.	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. 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> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	The proposals for the release of GB in Mayford would weaken not create a defensible Green Belt Boundary. Strong boundaries are prominent physical features e.g. escarpment, the proposal would result in the loss of an escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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. 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.In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure. Residents will be isolated unless they have access to a car	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other	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</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
				supporting infrastructure. Residents will be isolated unless they have access to a car		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.	
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure. Residents will be isolated unless they have access to 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl. The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR- this undermines its significance.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl. The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR- this undermines its significance.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl. The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR- this undermines its significance.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	There was no consultation on the GBBR. Government requires consultation with local residents and it seems unfair that GB10 and GB11 should be taken out of GB use between 2027-2040. This seems premature given that circumstances may change in the future and there may be future changes to relevant legislation and guidelines.  Safeguarding the site in advance of proven requirement prejudices future guidelines and the rights of resident's views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 10.0, 17.0, 6.0 and 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	There was no consultation on the GBBR. Government requires consultation with local residents and it seems unfair that GB10 and GB11 should be taken out of GB use between 2027-2040. This seems premature given that circumstances may change in the future and there may be future changes to relevant legislation and guidelines. Safeguarding the site in advance of proven requirement prejudices future guidelines and the rights of resident's views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 10.0, 17.0, 6.0 and 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	There was no consultation on the GBBR. Government requires consultation with local residents and it seems unfair that GB10 and GB11 should be taken out of GB use between 2027-2040. This seems premature given that circumstances may change in the future and there may be future changes to relevant legislation and guidelines.  Safeguarding the site in advance of proven requirement prejudices future guidelines and the rights of resident's views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 10.0, 17.0, 6.0 and 8.0	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	There should be consultation with local residents as part of the GBBR. Land ownership appears to be an important consideration as to whether the site is identified for future development and removal from the GB. This should have no bearing on the decisions. The assessment should be based on whether the sites perform clear functions of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	There should be consultation with local residents as part of the GBBR. Land ownership appears to be an important consideration as to whether the site is identified for future development and removal from the GB. This should have no bearing on the decisions. The assessment should be based on whether the sites perform clear functions of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	There should be consultation with local residents as part of the GBBR. Land ownership appears to be an important consideration as to whether the site is identified for future development and removal from the GB. This should have no bearing on the decisions. The assessment should be based on whether the sites perform clear functions of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	Object to proposals. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council.  Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040. The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	Object to proposals. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council.  Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040. The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 particularly 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	Object to proposals. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040. The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 particularly 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate 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 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate 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 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. Consideration for development in spite of this is fundamentally wrong. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. Consideration for development in spite of this is fundamentally wrong. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. Consideration for development in spite of this is fundamentally wrong. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	Infrastructure factors have not been properly considered.  The GBBR suggests that it takes 7 mins to get to Woking Town Centre- this is not accurate.  Local road are inadequate to accommodate the proposed growth and additional traffic e.g.Hook Hill Lane and Saunders Lane are narrow road.  The local bridges are single lane and cannot cope with 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 representation regarding congestion and impact to 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	Infrastructure factors have not been properly considered. The GBBR suggests that it takes 7 mins to get to Woking Town Centre- this is not accurate. Local road are inadequate to accommodate the proposed growth and additional traffic e.g.Hook Hill Lane and Saunders Lane are narrow road. The local bridges are single lane and cannot cope with 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 representation regarding congestion and impact to the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	Infrastructure factors have not been properly considered.  The GBBR suggests that it takes 7 mins to get to Woking Town Centre- this is not accurate.  Local road are inadequate to accommodate the proposed growth and additional traffic e.g.Hook Hill Lane and Saunders Lane are narrow road.  The local bridges are single lane and cannot cope with 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 representation regarding congestion and impact to 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	The removal of GB14 for Green Infrastructure is not necessary as no change is planned. It is not an exceptional circumstance.	None stated.	The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	WBC are recommending changes to the GB based on the GBBR. However it is considered that the assessment is flawed and inconsistent.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	WBC are recommending changes to the GB based on the GBBR. However it is considered that the assessment is flawed and inconsistent.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	WBC are recommending changes to the GB based on the GBBR. However it is considered that the assessment is flawed and inconsistent.	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
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB10	No consideration has been given to the Council's CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals would be contrary to this requirement.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB11	No consideration has been given to the Council's CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals would be contrary to this requirement.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1299	Robert, Gillian	Catt	GB14	No consideration has been given to the Council's CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals would be contrary to this requirement.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
320	Michael	Cauter	GB10	The proposals are contrary to the Councils policy to conserve and enhance the existing character of its landscapes and natural features	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB11	The proposals are contrary to the Councils policy to conserve and enhance the existing character of its landscapes and natural features	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB14	The proposals are contrary to the Councils policy to conserve and enhance the existing character of its landscapes and natural features	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB10	The highways and transport network will be overloaded from the new proposals, with limited possibility for any relief	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB11	The highways and transport network will be overloaded from the new proposals, with limited possibility for any relief	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB14	The highways and transport network will be overloaded from the new proposals, with limited possibility for any relief	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
320	Michael	Cauter	GB10	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only requires the identification of 550 homes between 2022-2027. GB land is precious and 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 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
320	Michael	Cauter	GB11	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only requires the identification of 550 homes between 2022-2027. GB land is precious and 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 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
320	Michael	Cauter	GB14	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only requires the identification of 550 homes between 2022-2027.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				GB land is precious and should be protected for future generations.			
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB8	There is not the need for a new leisure centre. Woking Leisure Centre and Guildford Spectrum are both very close. Support the school proposal and appreciate the leisure facilities will benefit the pupils. However facilities will create additional traffic and require more thought than given in the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance. The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. In addition, the Council has and is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in addressing the strategic impacts of the Site Allocation DPD on the highways network. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB9	There is not the need for a new leisure centre. Woking Leisure Centre and Guildford Spectrum are both very close. Support the school proposal and appreciate the leisure facilities will benefit the pupils. However facilities will create additional traffic and require more thought than given in the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. In addition, the Council has and is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in addressing the strategic impacts of the Site Allocation DPD on the highways network. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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</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
						residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.	
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB10	There is not the need for a new leisure centre. Woking Leisure Centre and Guildford Spectrum are both very close. Support the school proposal and appreciate the leisure facilities will benefit the pupils. However facilities will create additional traffic and require more thought than given in the DPD.	None stated.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance. The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. In addition, the Council has and is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in addressing the strategic impacts of the Site Allocation DPD on the highways network. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB11	There is not the need for a new leisure centre. Woking Leisure Centre and Guildford Spectrum are both very close. Support the school proposal and appreciate the leisure facilities will benefit the pupils. However facilities will create additional traffic and require more thought than given in the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. In addition, the Council has and is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in addressing the strategic impacts of the Site Allocation DPD on the highways network. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on the site. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB8	Object to developing the site for housing. 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 on the impact on the character of the village.	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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB9	Object to developing the site for housing. 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 on 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB10	Object to developing the site for housing. 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 on 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB11	Object to developing the site for housing. 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 on 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	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
901	Richard	Chalkley	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. 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected 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. 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).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
901	Richard	Chalkley	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.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	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.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	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.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and	Please reconsider	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	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
				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.	your plans	Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	of this representation
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston Station but 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston Station but 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston Station but 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
901	Richard	Chalkley	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston Station but 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
281	Brian	Chapman	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
281	Brian	Chapman	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
281	Brian	Chapman	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
281	Brian	Chapman	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	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. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
281	Brian	Chapman	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 housing need. This 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
281	Brian	Chapman	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					sites		
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 road, 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 road, 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district road, 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 road, 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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, 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 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.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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	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
				should Mayford develop further.			
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
				residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.			
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	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	No further modification is 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 combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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	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	No further modification is 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.		enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 fields 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 fields 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 fields 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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 fields 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	<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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	<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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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.	<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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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	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
				or not.			
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1025	Maxwell	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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)	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
					explored.		
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.  The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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	The site should be removed from	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	No further modification is 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 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 DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 road, 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 road, 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.	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district road, 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 road, 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	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 Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 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.			
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.		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.	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 fields 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 fields 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 fields 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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 fields 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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	No further modification is 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.	
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1026	Sarah	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.  The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Working Core Strategy 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 DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 road, 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 road, 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district road, 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 road, 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 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.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general</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
						conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.	
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
				residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.			
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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	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
						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.	of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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	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
				excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.			
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 fields 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 fields 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 fields 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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 fields 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are 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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	<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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	<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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	<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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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.	<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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1027	Jacob	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.			
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mavford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	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. With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.  The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				When considering sites adjacent to main road and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.		The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.  The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.			
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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	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
				pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	<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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.</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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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.	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. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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	No further modification is 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 about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
1241	Peter	Chapman	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 road 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. 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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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 road 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.  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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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 road 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.  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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The road 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. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.  As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	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
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1241	Peter	Chapman	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB12	Object to the release of Green Belt land. Goes against Green Belt principles and objectives. Also has an important role in maintaining designated areas of natural habitat.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>In addition the Council has considered the landscape impacts of the proposed allocations and has set this out in section 7.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see section 23.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. 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
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB13	Object to the release of Green Belt land. Goes against Green Belt principles and objectives. Also has an important role in maintaining designated areas of natural habitat.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0. In addition the Council has considered the landscape impacts of the proposed allocations and has set this out in section 7.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see section 23.0. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB12	Pyrford is semi-rural with heritage assets, which are highly valued. Development would damage these assets and ruin village life.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB13	Pyrford is semi-rural with heritage assets, which are highly valued. Development would damage these assets and ruin village life.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB12	Infrastructure and the road network will not be able to support development. In particular the road network is congested and will be more dangerous. Other developments in the area will also make the situation worse and the 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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will 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
				are not suitable for heavy traffic.		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.	
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB13	Infrastructure and the road network will not be able to support development. In particular the road network is congested and will be more dangerous. Other developments in the area will also make the situation worse and the road are not suitable for heavy traffic.	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
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB12	Don't spoil the village	None stated.	The Council considers the proposed allocation of this site to be suitable for development when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).  The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1702	Barbara	Chapman	GB13	Don't spoil the village	None stated.	The Council considers the proposed allocation of this site to be suitable for development when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).  The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
336	Celia	Chapple	GB11	Development in of this site will destroy the vital wild plants corridor on the site, evidence supports this (reference to data PlantLife and the National Plant Monitoring Scheme. Tel: 01722 342730. Plot reference SU9856.)	Review data from PlantLife and the National Plant Monitoring Scheme. Tel: 01722 342730. Plot reference	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					SU9856.Do not develop this land.	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.	
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Parvis Road is already congested at peak times. Major housebuilding will create severe transport problems for all users. Related to this is the increase in emissions and the impact on health.	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 road. 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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Parvis Road is already congested at peak times. Major housebuilding will create severe transport problems for all users.Related to this is the increase in emissions and the impact on health.	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 road. 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> <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</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
						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.	
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	There is a lack of school places and the unsustainable housebuilding will exacerbate problems. Further school buildings in adjacent villages may be welcomed however a traffic movement plan should be prepared.	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding schools has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The 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 road. 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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	There is a lack of school places and the unsustainable housebuilding will exacerbate problems. Further school buildings in adjacent villages may be welcomed however a traffic movement plan should be prepared.	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding schools has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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 road. 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 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	There are no medical facilities in Byfleet. This needs to be addressed before any new major schemes come forward	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	There are no medical facilities in Byfleet. This needs to be addressed before any new major schemes come forward	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Byfleet has suffered from problems over drainage, services/utilities. It is important that the services and utilities infrastructure is thoroughly tested before any development takes place	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Ongoing maintenance will be generally be the responsibility of these companies. 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).</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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Byfleet has suffered from problems over drainage, services/utilities. It is important that the services and utilities infrastructure is thoroughly tested before any development takes place	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities. The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Ongoing maintenance will be generally be the responsibility of these companies. 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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	7. Master planning: Every time a large scheme of service improvement takes place, similar to the Gas pipe service along the Old Woking Road B382 then every other utility should be considered to amalgamate into a scheme which may include updating/improving their own service provision. Thereby eliminating several utility /service companies having to execute works along the same routes over time. Finally the Surrey County Council should ensure that the road re-surfacing takes place after all the aforementioned services have completed their works of improvement or service increase.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.  All reasonable effort is made to constructively and positively work with authorities and service providers to coordinate infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	7. Master planning: Every time a large scheme of service improvement takes place, similar to the Gas pipe service along the Old Woking Road B382 then every other utility should be considered to amalgamate into a scheme which may include updating/improving their own service provision. Thereby eliminating several utility /service companies having to execute works along the same routes over time. Finally the Surrey County Council should ensure that the road re-surfacing takes place after all the aforementioned services have completed their works of improvement or service increase.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.  All reasonable effort is made to constructively and positively work with authorities and service providers to coordinate infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Until actions are taken to test and improve infrastructure, utilities, traffic, flooding. Development in Byfleet should not progress	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Until actions are taken to test and improve infrastructure, utilities, traffic, flooding. Development in Byfleet should not progress	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	UA1	The principle of inclusion is supported. Suggestions made on other uses the site could accommodate e.g. basement parking, medical facilities, doctors, youth centre, library at ground floor and up to 16 flats on the upper floors.	None stated.	The proposed allocation is for mixed use development to comprise of residential, replacement library and community uses. Therefore this does not preclude the uses suggested in the representation.  With regards to the representation about parking, 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.  Other points raised are detailed matters that will be considered and addressed during the planning application stage. 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 design standard. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Byfleet does not have the spare Green Belt land to give up for major housing needs of those coming in from outside of the Borough	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Byfleet does not have the spare Green Belt land to give up for major housing needs of those coming in from outside of the Borough	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	Elsewhere in Byfleet attempts should be made to increase density- e.g. Eden Grove Road. Areas could be demolished and redeveloped to create new apartments with sufficient tree planting on the edges for screening	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.7. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to assess the capacity of urban area to accommodate the housing requirement. The assessment considered the potential of sites this indicates a shortfall for the whole plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	Notes that GB17 is allocated for SANG. This is supported if the constraints are addressed	None stated.	The support is noted. The Council agrees that outstanding issues will need to be addressed	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	More attention should be given to brownfield sites, a diligent search for these sites to accommodate development could mean the need is met without encroaching on the GB	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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	Wide spread concern about the document and the methodology used. Does not consider the term 'safeguarding' to be an accurate description of proposals for the site.	Do not use the term 'safeguarding'- it implied safeguarding from any change not safeguarding for development	<p>For the purpose of Site Allocation DPD a "safeguarded site" is safeguarded to meet the long term development needs of the Borough between 2027-2040. If it is intended to be "safeguarded" for an alternative use then it will be clearly stated e.g. GB14 is a "safeguarded site for green infrastructure".</p> <p>Please also the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 2.0</p>	Add "safeguarded site" to Appendix 6 glossary and define its meaning
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	Residents would be happy for Byfleet sites to be safeguarded in perpetuity against development.	None stated.	<p>For the purpose of Site Allocation DPD a "safeguarded site" is safeguarded to meet the long term development needs of the Borough between 2027-2040. If it is intended to be "safeguarded" for an alternative use then it will be clearly stated e.g. GB14 is a "safeguarded site for green infrastructure".</p> <p>Please also the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 2.0</p>	Add "safeguarded site" to Appendix 6 glossary and define its meaning
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Object to proposals GB4 and GB5. The land is within a flood zone. Redevelopment will exacerbate problems here.A flood and drainage report undertaken by the Byfleet West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents Association will be sent to Woking Borough for consideration.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific issues.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
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Object to proposals GB4 and GB5. The land is within a flood zone. Redevelopment will exacerbate problems here. A flood and drainage report undertaken by the Byfleet West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents Association will be sent to Woking Borough for consideration.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific issues.</p> <p>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</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
						Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB4	Given the urgent need for housing, officers need to ensure that all necessary work has been done before considering the release of GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	GB5	Given the urgent need for housing, officers need to ensure that all necessary work has been done before considering the release of GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
367	Godfrey	Chapples	General	Roads are a problem throughout the Borough. It is necessary to carry out a detailed survey for the whole of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in 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
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB4	It is not right to build in an area where there is limited supporting infrastructure e.g. doctors, schools	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 representation regarding education provision has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB5	It is not right to build in an area where there is limited supporting infrastructure e.g. doctors, schools	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 representation regarding education provision has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB4	Object to proposals in Byfleet. There is little open space in Byfleet and this is where WBC are proposing for new housing	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. In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB5	Object to proposals in Byfleet. There is little open space in Byfleet and this is where WBC are proposing for new housing	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</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 relatively modest.</p> <p>In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.</p>	
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB4	Please consider the scale of proposals in Byfleet . Limited growth on existing developed land is desirable over the proposed alternative.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB5	Please consider the scale of proposals in Byfleet . Limited growth on existing developed land is desirable over the proposed alternative.	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
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB4	It is not right to build in an area where there are already congested road e.g. Parvis 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; 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 adjacent road. 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
377	Pauline	Chapples	GB5	It is not right to build in an area where there are already congested road e.g. 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 24.0. 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 road. 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Green Belt 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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	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	No further modification is 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.		the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB9	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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	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
				allowed within 400m.			
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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).	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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	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
				inappropriate development			
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result 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
						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.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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.	<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 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</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
						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.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse 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.	
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Worpleston 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Worpleston 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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 Worpleston 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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1641	J M	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.		<p>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>	
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	General	The proposed plans will destroy Mayford as we know it. Those making the decisions will move onto other areas once they retire and leave us locals with the carnage.	None stated.	<p>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 Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land in particular areas of the Borough. Nevertheless 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 reasonable alternatives. Overall the amount of land proposed to be removed from the Green Belt after all the allocated sites have been developed is about 3.46%. 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB9	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.		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.	of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	No further modification is 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.	
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.</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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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. 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1667	P	Cheeseman	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.	<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 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</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
						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.	
1667	P	Cheeseman	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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 road 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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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	No further modification is 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>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>	
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1667	P	Cheeseman	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
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB13	I am writing to object to these two fields being taken out of the Green Belt. The Green Belt should not be eroded but be protected. It is important for the survival of fauna and flora, and home to much wildlife. People choose to live in Pyrford because of its situation and do not want to be in a large built up 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 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
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB12	I am writing to object to these two fields being taken out of the Green Belt. The Green Belt should not be eroded but be protected. It is important for the survival of fauna and flora, and home to much wildlife. People choose to live in Pyrford because of its situation and do not want to be in a large built up area.	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. 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB12	There is a huge lack of affordable housing and properties suitable for the elderly for downsizing. Better to build starter homes and retirement apartments on existing developed areas, not large luxury apartments and houses (for example, Oakfield School development). I hope the Council listens to the objections of local people. We do not want the Green Belt diminished.	None stated.	The Council has policies to ensure that a broad range of house types are provided to meet the needs of the area as set out in Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. 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
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB13	There is a huge lack of affordable housing and properties suitable for the elderly for downsizing. Better to build starter homes and retirement apartments on existing developed areas, not large luxury apartments and houses (for example, Oakfield School development). I hope the Council listens to the objections of local people. We do not want the Green Belt diminished.	None stated.	The Council has robust policies to ensure that development reflects the range of house types needed in the area. 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
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB12	This would completely change the nature of Pyrford village. Inadequate facilities to support more population: school already oversubscribed, insufficient parking, no medical centre, inadequate bus service. People would have to drive to West Byfleet or Woking, local road already congested and gridlocks if accident on the M25 or A3. Traffic noise already awful at rush hour and would worsen. The Council has previously resisted development on one of these fields due to increased pressure on the road, especially access to A3, what would this not now be a problem? If development goes ahead on Wisley airfield, traffic will be horrendous.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. 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. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The 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, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. The evidence is set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1095	Hilary	Cheetham	GB13	This would completely change the nature of Pyrford village. Inadequate facilities to support more population: school already oversubscribed, insufficient parking, no medical centre, inadequate bus service. People would have to drive to West Byfleet or Woking, local road already congested and gridlocks if accident on the M25 or A3. Traffic noise already	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when 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
				awful at rush hour and would worsen. The Council has previously resisted development on one of these fields due to increased pressure on the road, especially access to A3, what would this not now be a problem? If development goes ahead on Wisley airfield, traffic will be horrendous.		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. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The 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.	
646	Margaret	Cheney	GB10	Objects to the proposal, for the reasons listed by the Society. The proposals are excessive in nature, and the area's infrastructure is inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
646	Margaret	Cheney	GB11	Objects to the proposal, for the reasons listed by the Society. The proposals are excessive in nature, and the area's infrastructure is inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
646	Margaret	Cheney	GB14	Objects to the proposal, for the reasons listed by the Society. The proposals are excessive in nature, and the area's infrastructure is inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB8	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs. The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been 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
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB9	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs.  The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been 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
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB10	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and	None stated.	The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery	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
				Guildford.		<p>of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs.</p> <p>The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p>	of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB11	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	<p>The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs. The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB14	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	<p>The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs.</p> <p>The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB7	Objects to development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt separates Mayford from Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	<p>The housing needs of the Borough are clearly set out in the Core Strategy as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to address local housing needs.</p> <p>The Council accepts that there are benefits to living in this locality. Nevertheless 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. 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 separation distances between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB7	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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</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>on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant 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>	
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB8	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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 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 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
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB9	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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 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 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</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
						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.	
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB10	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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 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
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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 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
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB14	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						(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.	
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB7	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB8	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB9	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB10	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB11	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
892	Beryl	Cherrett	GB14	Concerned new residents will not be involved in village life.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB12	I object. Pyrford has a unique semi-rural feel but is close to already over-crowded areas (West Byfleet, Woking). The infrastructure could not cope. The sites should be protected as part of a heritage view to the North Downs.	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
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB13	I object. Pyrford has a unique semi-rural feel but is close to already over-crowded areas (West Byfleet, Woking). The infrastructure could not cope. The sites should be protected as part of a heritage view to the North Downs.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB12	Pyrford Common Road, a cut-through from Ripley to the A3, is already busy. Newark Bridge and Lane are unsuitable. Even more so if Wisley Airfield go ahead. Local school is at capacity. There are no plans for a doctors' surgery, homes for the elderly or affordable homes.	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
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB13	Pyrford Common Road, a cut-through from Ripley to the A3, is already busy. Newark Bridge and Lane are unsuitable. Even more so if Wisley Airfield go ahead. Local school is at capacity. There are no plans for a doctors' surgery, homes for the elderly or affordable homes.	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. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is working with its neighbouring authorities such Guildford Borough Council to make sure traffic implications of cross boundary significance is fully addressed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB13	This proposal should be turned down. These sites consistently fulfil the Green Belt criteria of poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. The Council has ignored previous correspondence from Pyrford residents.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. 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 Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape 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
1145	Carole	Chessun	GB12	This proposal should be turned down. These sites consistently fulfil the Green Belt criteria of poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. The Council has ignored previous correspondence from Pyrford residents.	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 landscape 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB4	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB5	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing 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
						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.	
122	Barry	Chester	GB12	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB13	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB15	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB16	The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on the character of the 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 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB4	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB5	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
122	Barry	Chester	GB12	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB13	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB15	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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 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. 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
122	Barry	Chester	GB16	The road network and local infrastructure is not able to cope with the increase in population 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB4	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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	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
						undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB5	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB12	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB13	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB15	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
122	Barry	Chester	GB16	The proposed development is not supported locally and they will move out of the area if the plans go ahead.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB8	Strongly objects to housing proposals. WBC state that Green Belt development is required to meet housing targets. Why have they been concentrated in Mayford (569 houses).	None stated.	<p>This is factually incorrect. As highlighted within the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land for development in Mayford, Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. This has been based on robust evidence that is set out within the Council's evidence base. The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are proposed to be released from the Green Belt post 2027.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the whole of 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB9	Strongly objects to housing proposals. WBC state that Green Belt development is required to meet housing targets. Why have they been concentrated in Mayford (569 houses).	None stated.	<p>This is factually incorrect. As highlighted within the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land for development in Mayford, Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. This has been based on robust evidence that is set out within the Council's evidence base. The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are proposed to be released from the Green Belt post 2027.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the whole of 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB10	Strongly objects to housing proposals. WBC state that Green Belt development is required to meet housing targets. Why have they been concentrated in Mayford (569 houses).	None stated.	<p>This is factually incorrect. As highlighted within the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land for development in Mayford, Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. This has been based on robust evidence that is set out within the Council's evidence base. The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are proposed to be released from the Green Belt post 2027. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the whole of 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB11	Strongly objects to housing proposals. WBC state that Green Belt development is required to meet housing targets. Why have they been concentrated in Mayford (569 houses).	None stated.	<p>This is factually incorrect. As highlighted within the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land for development in Mayford, Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. This has been based on robust evidence that is set out within the Council's evidence base. The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are proposed to be released from the Green Belt post 2027.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the whole of 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</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
						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.	
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB14	Strongly objects to housing proposals. WBC state that Green Belt development is required to meet housing targets. Why have they been concentrated in Mayford (569 houses).	None stated.	<p>This is factually incorrect. As highlighted within the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land for development in Mayford, Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. This has been based on robust evidence that is set out within the Council's evidence base. The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are proposed to be released from the Green Belt post 2027.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the whole of 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	General	Support the proposal as long as it is in keeping with adjacent properties.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB10	Infrastructure is not there to support such an expansion in population. The consequences of additional traffic have not been considered	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. Wider infrastructure issues have been addressed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB11	Infrastructure is not there to support such an expansion in population. The consequences of additional traffic have not been considered	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. Wider infrastructure issues have been addressed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11. 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</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
						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.	
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB14	Infrastructure is not there to support such an expansion in population. The consequences of additional traffic have not been considered	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. Wider infrastructure issues have been addressed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11. 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
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB8	Infrastructure is not there to support such an expansion in population. The consequences of additional traffic have not been considered	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. Wider infrastructure issues have been addressed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11. 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
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB9	Infrastructure is not there to support such an expansion in population. The consequences of additional traffic have not been considered	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. Wider infrastructure issues have been addressed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11. 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	No further modification is 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.</p>	
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB9	Egley Road is congested and will worsen with the new school. With limitations to the railway bridges, there will be gridlock locally.	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 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. In addition, the key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB8	Egley Road is congested and will worsen with the new school. With limitations to the railway bridges, there will be gridlock locally.	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</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
						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. In addition, the key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB10	Egley Road is congested and will worsen with the new school. With limitations to the railway bridges, there will be gridlock locally.	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. In addition, the key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB11	Egley Road is congested and will worsen with the new school. With limitations to the railway bridges, there will be gridlock locally.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						proposals 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. In addition, the key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB14	Egley Road is congested and will worsen with the new school. With limitations to the railway bridges, there will be gridlock locally.	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 access by foot and cycle. 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. In addition, the key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. It should be noted that the proposed allocation of GB14 does not allocate the site for development but Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB8	The plans will destroy the nature of Mayford as a separate historic village in the Green Belt. Also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding heritage 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> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to remove Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map, from the Green Belt. Therefore Green Policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy as well as other development plan documents will continue to apply.</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
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB9	The plans will destroy the nature of Mayford as a separate historic village in the Green Belt. Also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding heritage 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> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to remove Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map, from the Green Belt. Therefore Green Policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy as well as other development plan documents will continue to apply. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB10	The plans will destroy the nature of Mayford as a separate historic village in the Green Belt. Also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding heritage 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> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to remove Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map, from the Green Belt. Therefore Green Policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy as well as other development plan documents will continue to apply.</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
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB11	The plans will destroy the nature of Mayford as a separate historic village in the Green Belt. Also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding heritage 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> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to remove Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map, from the Green Belt. Therefore Green Policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy as well as other development plan documents will continue to apply.</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
786	Peter and Barbara	Chester	GB14	The plans will destroy the nature of Mayford as a separate historic village in the Green Belt. Also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding heritage 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> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to remove Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map, from the Green Belt. Therefore Green Policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy as well as other development plan documents will continue to apply. 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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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	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
					land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.		
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the 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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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).	
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	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	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 Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council 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
				local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene.		different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape 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.	
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB8	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB9	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB10	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	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
550	Simon	Chiswell	GB11	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	Given the lack of acknowledged open public spaces in South Woking, it is a good opportunity to preserve the area and green space for all to enjoy rather than high density low quality homes.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS8 notes that new residential development outside of the Special Protection Areas and their exclusion zones will be required to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The Council is proposing an additional 6 new public open spaces in the Borough through the Site Allocations DPD. In addition, CS17 sets out that new residential development will be required to provide open space as part of a development scheme. The Council has set this out within the key requirements for the draft site allocation.  It should also be noted that draft allocation GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure purposes and not for development.  The Council has robust policies and guidance in place to ensure that future development is of good design and quality. These include Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>SPD.</p> <p>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 could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	Given the lack of acknowledged open public spaces in South Woking, it is a good opportunity to preserve the area and green space for all to enjoy rather than high density low quality homes.	None stated.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS8 notes that new residential development outside of the Special Protection Areas and their exclusion zones will be required to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The Council is proposing an additional 6 new public open spaces in the Borough through the Site Allocations DPD. In addition, CS17 sets out that new residential development will be required to provide open space as part of a development scheme. The Council has set this out within the key requirements for the draft site allocation. It should also be noted that draft allocation GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure purposes and not for development. The Council has robust policies and guidance in place to ensure that future development is of good design and quality. These include Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD. 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 could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need. The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	Government and independent reports recently stressed the value of green open public spaces for health and well being as well as the community benefits. GB10 and GB11 should be open public space.	Classification of the land GB10 & GB11 to become open public green space.	<p>The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	Government and independent reports recently stressed the value of green open public spaces for health and well being as well as the community benefits. GB10 and GB11 should be open public space.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	Concerns over the negative and damaging proposals for the area in Hook Heath and Mayford.	I would strongly recommend that these particular pockets of land do not have their	<p>Concerns regarding the proposed allocation of sites GB10 and GB11 noted. The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</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 status removed and in fact become designated an area of publicly accessible green open space- in effect a natural country park.		
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	Concerns over the negative and damaging proposals for the area in Hook Heath and Mayford.	I would strongly recommend that these particular pockets of land do not have their green belt status removed and in fact become designated an area of publicly accessible green open space- in effect a natural country park.	Concerns regarding the proposed allocation of sites GB10 and GB11 noted.  The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	Whilst I recognize the need to plan into the future to accommodate the need for housing, the proposals do not comply with the NPPF. They disregard and want to reduce the Green Belt, which includes public open spaces and woodland and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. Urge you to consider allocating the sites as open green space for the community and safeguard it from development.	None stated.	The Council believe that the draft Site Allocations DPD is compliment with the NPPF. As set out in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy housing requirements are based on a clear understanding of housing needs in the area and the various constraints to development in the Borough. The Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a broad location for future housing and recommended a Green Belt boundary review to be carried out to identify suitable sites. The Council have also taken this opportunity to identify land for future housing needs, as set out in paragraph 85 of the NPPF.  The representation regarding the loss of open space and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.  The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan. More information on this matter is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	Whilst I recognize the need to plan into the future to accommodate the need for housing, the proposals do not comply with the NPPF. They disregard and want to reduce the Green Belt, which includes public open spaces and woodland and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. Urge you to consider allocating the sites as open green space for the community and safeguard it from development.	None stated.	The Council believe that the draft Site Allocations DPD is compliment with the NPPF. As set out in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy housing requirements are based on a clear understanding of housing needs in the area and the various constraints to development in the Borough. The Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a broad location for future housing and recommended a Green Belt boundary review to be carried out to identify suitable sites. The Council have also taken this opportunity to identify land for future housing needs, as set out in paragraph 85 of the NPPF. The representation regarding the loss of open space and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0. The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed development site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						plan. More information on this matter is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.	
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states that 550 homes need to be found in the Green Belt up to 2027. The proposed site is for an additional 1200 homes between 2027-2040 and not based on firm evidence. WBC has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this number of dwellings or any other number in the Green Belt post 2027.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states that 550 homes need to be found in the Green Belt up to 2027. The proposed site is for an additional 1200 homes between 2027-2040 and not based on firm evidence. WBC has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this number of dwellings or any other number in the Green Belt post 2027.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB14	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states that 550 homes need to be found in the Green Belt up to 2027. The proposed site is for an additional 1200 homes between 2027-2040 and not based on firm evidence. WBC has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this number of dwellings or any other number in the Green Belt post 2027.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB10	Purposes of Green Belt are to prevent sprawl and maintaining open spaces and woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals conflict with this and Mayford and Hook Heath will become part of Woking.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB11	Purposes of Green Belt are to prevent sprawl and maintaining open spaces and woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals conflict with this and Mayford and Hook Heath will become part of Woking.	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
1673	Joan M	Chitty	GB14	Purposes of Green Belt are to prevent sprawl and maintaining open spaces and woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals conflict with this and Mayford and Hook Heath will become part of Woking.	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
324	R	Chopra	GB10	Object to the release of GB land GB10, GB11 and GB14 post 2027.	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
324	R	Chopra	GB11	Object to the release of GB land GB10, GB11 and GB14 post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
324	R	Chopra	GB14	It is not considered necessary to release GB14 from the GB for Green Infrastructure. There is no change of use and it is not a case for exceptional circumstances	None stated.	The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
324	R	Chopra	GB10	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
324	R	Chopra	GB11	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
455	M	Christie	GB13	Half of the sites in Pyrford (GB13) go against the recommendations of the Green Belt Boundary Review.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
455	M	Christie	GB12	The lack of social and transport infrastructure will be compounded by development on the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand generated from that development. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. In terms of healthcare, 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
455	M	Christie	GB13	The lack of social and transport infrastructure will be compounded by development on the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand generated from that development. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. In terms of healthcare, 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
455	M	Christie	GB12	Implores the Council to consider Pyrford residents' views and also potential road chaos.	None stated.	All representations will be considered, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and planning regulations and guidance. With regard to road, the representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB13	Implores the Council to consider Pyrford residents' views and also potential road chaos.	None stated.	All representations will be considered, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and planning regulations and guidance. With regard to road, the representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB12	Roads around Pyrford and West Byfleet are already overcrowded and increasingly dangerous for cyclists. This is alarming.	None stated.	This representation is partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11). In addition, 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. Provision for cycle links (and pedestrian facilities) are included as potential issues to be addressed through a contribution to transport infrastructure in the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB13	Roads around Pyrford and West Byfleet are already overcrowded and increasingly dangerous for cyclists. This is alarming.	None stated.	This representation is partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11). In addition, 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. Provision for cycle links (and pedestrian facilities) are included as potential issues to be addressed through a contribution to transport infrastructure in the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB12	Concerned about development at this site due to loss of Green Belt and heritage views from the Pyrford escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB13	Concerned about development at this site due to loss of Green Belt and heritage views from the Pyrford escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB12	Participation in Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum means the respondent understands the strength of local feeling about this development.	None stated.	Comment noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB13	Participation in Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum means the respondent understands the strength of local feeling about this development.	None stated.	Comment noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB12	Values the village feel and proximity to open fields and magnificent views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
455	M	Christie	GB13	Values the village feel and proximity to open fields and magnificent views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1696	Graham	Chrystie	General	Dissatisfied with the lack of proper up to date landscape appraisal to inform the DPD;  The Council has not carried out a heritage assessment and a Conservation Area assessment for many years, which will breach the requirements of the NPPF. The failure to carry out the above call into question the validity of the DPD as it affects Pyrford;	None stated.	No up-to-date Landscape Character Assessment had been published prior to the publication of the Site Allocations DPD for Regulation 18 consultation. The Woking Character Study only focused on the townscape of Woking. To address the landscape implications of the proposed allocations in the Site Allocations DPD a preliminary assessment of the landscape characteristics of various parcels of land were undertaken as part of the Green Belt boundary review (a copy of the Green Belt boundary review report is on the website). Whilst this is not a detailed landscape character study it provides a strategic overview of the prevailing landscape character of the parcels and their potential sensitivity to change and potential 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
				<p>The DPD is silent on the provision of infrastructure to support proposed growth, with all the emphasis on housing provision;</p> <p>There is no evidence on cross boundary cooperation to address the impacts of development within other districts and boroughs such as Guildford;</p> <p>General concern about the release of Green Belt land in the east of the Borough and its impacts on traffic congestion. Traffic survey data should be made available;</p> <p>Spatial planning and strategic planning seems lightweight. Sites are randomly selected to be released from the Green Belt, and should be subject to wider appraisal that is linked to a strategy. Other suitable sites other than Proposals GB12 and GB13 seem available and should be selected instead.</p>		<p>accommodating a strategic level of development. This level of assessment is sufficient to enable appropriate judgments to be made about the preferred sites to be released from the Green Belt for future development.</p> <p>The Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs to prepare a detailed Landscape Character Assessment. This has now been completed. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of the preferred sites to be released from the Green Belt on landscape ground.</p> <p>Whilst the Council acknowledges the importance of protecting the landscape character of the area the fundamental aim of the Green Belt boundary review is to ensure the protection of its purposes. These purposes are set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Green Belt boundary review has ensured that the parcels of land identified for consideration are consistently and rigorously appraised against the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Each proposed site allocations set out a number of key requirements to be met for development to be acceptable. The combination of the plan-making and development management processes will ensure that the development of the proposed sites will not undermine the landscape character of the area. It is also emphasised that the requirements of the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS24: 'Woking's landscape and townscape will apply to any proposal that would come forward to develop the allocated sites.</p> <p>The term Heritage Assets is defined in the Glossary of the Core Strategy. The Heritage of Woking Study (2000) provides an inventory of the heritage assets. 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 as a result of development pressures. For example, the policy ensures that there is a presumption against any development that will be harmful to a listed building. The requirements of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of any of the allocated sites if they are adopted. The Council is aware to carry out Conservation Area reviews when resources will allow. However, this is a separate matter that should not be a pre-requisite to the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the outcome of the Conservation Area reviews will have a direct bearing on protecting the five purposes of the Green Belt in so far as it will apply to sites in Pyrford.</p> <p>The Site Allocation DPD is not silent on the need for infrastructure to support future development. Appendix 1 of the DPD is a list of evidence that has been used to inform the DPD, and it includes how infrastructure needs have been identified and will be delivered. For example, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been carried out to provide an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support the proposed growth in the Core Strategy, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. A Regulation 123 List has been published with an indication of the infrastructure that the Council would want to spend its CIL levy. The Joint Committee has been given the overall responsibility to make sure that the Regulation 123 list is regularly reviewed to reflect infrastructure priorities for the area.</p> <p>A Woking Transport Strategy and Programme has been published by the County Council with the list of transport proposals that it is committed to delivered to address transport issues in the area when resources can be assembled. A revised transport assessment has been carried out to help identify any further proposals that will be needed to support the delivery of the Site Allocations DPD, and the County Council is in the process of developing further proposals to inform both the IDP and the Woking Transport Strategy and Programme.</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes robust policies to secure open space provision to support development.</p> <p>Thames Water has confirmed that subject to certain requirements being met at the planning application stage sewerage and wastewater infrastructure can be provided to support the proposed development.</p> <p>Affinity Water had also confirmed that subject to the growth proposed in the Core Strategy there is no risk to water supply.</p> <p>Finally, the County Council is satisfied that the educational needs of the area over the plan period can be met through expansion of existing schools and the allocation of a specific site for a secondary school.</p> <p>Whilst the Council accepts that the above will not be panacea to address existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision they will ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated by future development. It is therefore incorrect that the DPD has been silent on infrastructure provision.</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has worked with all the relevant neighbouring authorities and organisations to address the cross boundary implications of the Site Allocations DPD. A Duty to Cooperate and Consultation statements will be published respectively as part of the Submission Documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate how the Council has involved neighbouring authorities and other relevant organisations in addressing cross boundary implications of the DPD.</p> <p>Guildford Borough Council is in the process preparing its Local Plan. They continue to engage the Council to identify and address the cross boundary implications of their plan. Key Members of the Council had been invited in the past to attend some of their Duty to Cooperate events. The Council will continue to work with them to ensure that the adverse impacts of any development proposals in their area on Woking Borough are fully assessed and addressed. The same approach will apply to the other neighbouring authorities. Just as Woking, it will be expected that in due course Guildford Borough Council will be required at their Local Plan Examination to demonstrate how it has worked in partnership with its neighbouring authorities and other organisations to address strategic cross boundary issues.</p> <p>The Core Strategy establishes the principle for releasing Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The representation does not appear to challenge this general principle except that it is concerned about the release of sites in the east of the Borough and their impacts on congestion. The Council's primary objective is to make sure that the sites that it identifies to release from the Green Belt are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. In particular, their release from the Green Belt should have the least adverse impacts on its five purposes. The Council has carried a Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal, a Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Transport Assessment to inform the site selection process. Based on the evidence the release of the following sites east of the Borough GB12 and GB13 (Pyrford), GB15 and GB16 (West Byfleet) and GB4 and GB5 (Byfleet) will be less damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt when compared against the other reasonable alternatives considered, and in the context of the existing environmental constraints. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area has carried out a Strategic Transport Assessment of all the proposed allocations. It is satisfied that the transport implications of the proposed allocations can be mitigated by both additional strategic proposals and site specific requirements to be determined by detailed transport assessments. The delivery of any of the mitigation measures is not considered a pre-requisite to the allocation of any of the proposed sites. Details of the Strategic Transport Assessment were published on the Council's website prior to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD and have been available to the public since.</p> <p>The Core Strategy set out a clear spatial strategy for the spatial distribution of development across the Borough (Policy CS1: A Spatial Strategy for Woking Borough). It directs most new development to previously developed land in the Town, District and Local Centres. However, it also accepts that land will be required to be released from the Green Belt to meet housing delivery between 2022 and 2027. The overall spatial strategy was supported by the Inspector of the Secretary of State at the Core Strategy Examination. 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 has formed the context for the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. The DPD is also informed by a number of evidence base studies included at Appendix 1 of the DPD. In particular, all the sites have been sustainability appraised in a consistent manner against a clear set of sustainability objectives. The proposed allocations are therefore not randomly selected. Sites GB12 and GB13 are justified by the available evidence and the SA Report provides a clear summary of why the sites are preferred sites to be included in the DPD. The concern that the spatial strategy is lightweight and sites have been randomly selected is inaccurate.</p> <p>The representation had suggested that there are more suitable sites available to meet development needs than GB12 and GB13. However, it failed to mention what the other suitable sites are. Based on the above, Proposals GB12 and GB13 should be taken forward and published for Regulation 19 consultation and submitted for Examination.</p>	
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB12	Chipping away at the Green Belt is adding to the public's mistrust of politicians.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB13	Chipping away at the Green Belt is adding to the public's mistrust of politicians.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB12	WBC should not be attracting more people to the area when there are already problems coping with overcrowding, in terms of pressure on local infrastructure (GPs, schools). The	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposals will adversely affect schools and other services.		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.	
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB13	WBC should not be attracting more people to the area when there are already problems coping with overcrowding, in terms of pressure on local infrastructure (GPs, schools). The proposals will adversely affect schools and other 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
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB12	Residential road would become more dangerous with so many extra cars.	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 Upshot 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
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB13	Residential road would become more dangerous with so many extra cars.	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 Upshot 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</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
						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.	
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB12	Water companies has difficulty coping at present, and will not cope with so many extra families.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB13	Water companies has difficulty coping at present, and will not cope with so many extra families.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB12	Objects to the proposal as the whole purpose of the protection of Green Belt is that England doesn't become concreted over.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0, which deal with the reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1378	Valerie	Churchill	GB13	Objects to the proposal as the whole purpose of the protection of Green Belt is that England doesn't become concreted over.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0, which deal with the reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
32	Adele	Clare-Campbell	GB12	As a local resident of Pyrford since 2003, they have experienced problems in getting doctors appointments, school places and traffic problems. Development of more housing in the areas identified for Pyrford would add to existing infrastructure problems.	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
32	Adele	Clare-Campbell	GB13	As a local resident of Pyrford since 2003, they have experienced problems in getting doctors appointments, school places and traffic problems. Development of more housing in the areas identified for Pyrford would add to existing infrastructure problems.	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
1128	John	Clark	GB12	Environment - will inevitably detract from the separate identity of Pyrford, bringing it closer to merging with Woking.	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
1128	John	Clark	GB13	Environment - will inevitably detract from the separate identity of Pyrford, bringing it closer to merging with Woking.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1128	John	Clark	GB12	Government policy - Government to change the planning system to protect Green Belt, instead allowing automatic planning permission on all suitable brownfield sites.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land, including increased densities to meet the development needs of the area. See Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1128	John	Clark	GB13	Government policy - Government to change the planning system to protect Green Belt, instead allowing automatic planning permission on all suitable brownfield sites.	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
1128	John	Clark	GB12	I am concerned about: Road Access and Congestion - there are existing problems with the local road network: traffic, especially at rush hours and school times; exacerbated by proximity to M25, A3, A245, A325 and by events at the school, church and RHS; pedestrian safety; Pyrford, Oakcroft and Pyrford Common Roads junctions extremely busy; narrow lanes; restricted access to Ripley and Wisley. The situation will be adversely affected by increased traffic from this and other proposed developments (total increase of 1535 homes + 2300 homes at Wisley Airfield). Given the lengthy lead-in time, presumptions on traffic levels will change.	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
1128	John	Clark	GB13	I am concerned about: Road Access and Congestion - there are existing problems with the local road network: traffic, especially at rush hours and school times; exacerbated by proximity to M25, A3, A245, A325 and by events at the school, church and RHS; pedestrian safety; Pyrford, Oakcroft and Pyrford Common Roads junctions extremely busy; narrow lanes; restricted access to Ripley and Wisley. The situation will be adversely affected by increased traffic from this and other proposed developments (total increase of 1535 homes + 2300 homes at Wisley Airfield). Given the lengthy lead-in time, presumptions on traffic levels will change.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1128	John	Clark	GB12	Infrastructure - proposals will cause chaos unless local infrastructure is upgraded, changing the character of the area. Existing schools, nurseries, playgroups, doctors, dentists, elderly persons' accommodation, hospitals, etc. at critical capacity levels. Parking is difficult; improvements will increase congestion. Roads and trains extremely busy at peak times. Extension of Crossrail 2 would increase pressure on road. Surrey County Council predict a 25% increase in daily rail commuters to Waterloo within twenty years.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1128	John	Clark	GB13	Infrastructure - proposals will cause chaos unless local infrastructure is upgraded, changing the character of the area. Existing schools, nurseries, playgroups, doctors, dentists, elderly persons' accommodation, hospitals, etc. at critical capacity levels. Parking is difficult; improvements will increase congestion. Roads and trains extremely busy at peak times. Extension of Crossrail 2 would increase pressure on road. Surrey County Council predict a 25% increase in daily rail commuters to Waterloo within twenty years.	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
1329	Ross	Clark	General	The road cannot support 1400 extra cars. It is a daft idea to redevelop GB land.	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, 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	Policy restricts land to be released in exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for Identifying sites within the Green Belt for 1200 homes post the plan period (2027-2040).	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB8	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB9	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB14	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking between 2027-2040.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	Policy restricts land to be released in exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for Identifying sites within the Green Belt for 1200 homes post the plan period (2027-2040).	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB8	The removal of GB8,9,10,11,14 from the GB will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. This is inconsistent with the purpose of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB9	The removal of GB8,9,10,11,14 from the GB will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. This is inconsistent with the purpose of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	The removal of GB8,9,10,11,14 from the GB will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. This is inconsistent with the purpose of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	The removal of GB8,9,10,11,14 from the GB will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. This is inconsistent with the purpose of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB14	The removal of GB8,9,10,11,14 from the GB will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. This is inconsistent with the purpose of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	Object to proposals at GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and 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 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	Object to proposals at GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and 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 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB14	Object to proposals at GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and 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 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	The substantial development proposed for the area will place an major burden on infrastructure. Particularly on the road network which are inadequate to cope with the increase. Traffic issues would be exacerbated.	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, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	The substantial development proposed for the area will place an major burden on infrastructure. Particularly on the road network which are inadequate to cope with the increase.	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, 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	No further modification is 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 issues would be exacerbated.		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.	
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB8	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB9	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB14	The proposed density 30dph is not in keeping with the average density in the area which is a lot lower.	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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB8	The questionnaire does not allow scope for general comments therefore a letter is submitted. Object to the removal of GB10,11 and 14. The combination of high density development on GB8,9,10,11 will impose a major burden on infrastructure in the area- particularly on local road. The road are already congested at peak times and inadequate for high levels of traffic, the proposals, including the school, will exacerbate existing problems.	None stated.	The questionnaire was developed to focus comments on particular issues and Sections of the documents, nevertheless, the Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire for the next consultation on the DPD. This representation regarding density, infrastructure, traffic and infrastructure have been addressed in 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB9	The questionnaire does not allow scope for general comments therefore a letter is submitted.  Object to the removal of GB10,11 and 14. The combination of high density development on GB8,9,10,11 will impose a major burden on infrastructure in the area- particularly on local road. The road are already congested at peak times and inadequate for high levels of traffic, the proposals, including the school, will exacerbate existing problems.	None stated.	The questionnaire was developed to focus comments on particular issues and Sections of the documents, nevertheless, the Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire for the next consultation on the DPD.  This representation regarding density, infrastructure, traffic and infrastructure have been addressed in 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB10	<p>The questionnaire does not allow scope for general comments therefore a letter is submitted.</p> <p>Object to the removal of GB10,11 and 14. The combination of high density development on GB8,9,10.11 will impose a major burden on infrastructure in the area- particularly on local road. The road are already congested at peak times and inadequate for high levels of traffic, the proposals, including the school, will exacerbate existing problems.</p>	None stated.	<p>The questionnaire was developed to focus comments on particular issues and Sections of the documents, nevertheless, the Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire for the next consultation on the DPD.</p> <p>This representation regarding density, infrastructure, traffic and infrastructure have been addressed in 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB11	<p>The questionnaire does not allow scope for general comments therefore a letter is submitted.</p> <p>Object to the removal of GB10,11 and 14. The combination of high density development on GB8,9,10.11 will impose a major burden on infrastructure in the area- particularly on local road. The road are already congested at peak times and inadequate for high levels of traffic, the proposals, including the school, will exacerbate existing problems.</p>	None stated.	<p>The questionnaire was developed to focus comments on particular issues and Sections of the documents, nevertheless, the Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire for the next consultation on the DPD.</p> <p>This representation regarding density, infrastructure, traffic and infrastructure have been addressed in 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
1348	John, Marion	Clark	GB14	<p>The questionnaire does not allow scope for general comments therefore a letter is submitted.</p> <p>Object to the removal of GB10,11 and 14. The combination of high density development on GB8,9,10.11 will impose a major burden on infrastructure in the area- particularly on local road. The road are already congested at peak times and inadequate for high levels of traffic, the proposals, including the school, will exacerbate existing problems.</p>	None stated.	<p>The questionnaire was developed to focus comments on particular issues and Sections of the documents, nevertheless, the Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire for the next consultation on the DPD.</p> <p>This representation regarding density, infrastructure, traffic and infrastructure have been addressed in 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB8	A sequential approach must be undertaken when identifying sites. No urban area sites have been considered and raises doubt about the validity of the findings.	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB9	A sequential approach must be undertaken when identifying sites. No urban area sites have been considered and raises doubt about the validity of the findings.	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB10	A sequential approach must be undertaken when identifying sites. No urban area sites have been considered and raises doubt about the validity of the findings.	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB11	A sequential approach must be undertaken when identifying sites. No urban area sites have been considered and raises doubt about the validity of the findings.	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	A sequential approach must be undertaken when identifying sites. No urban area sites have been considered and raises doubt about the validity of the findings.	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proximity.		<p>addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.</p> <p>Also refer to Section 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4. Also refer to Section 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.</p> <p>Also refer to Section 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.</p> <p>Also refer to Section 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.</p> <p>Also refer to Section 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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.	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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>	
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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. 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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</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
						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).	
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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	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:</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
				also to represent my views.		Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	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 Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB8	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB9	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB10	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB11	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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 road 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 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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 road 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 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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 road 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 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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 road 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 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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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 road or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on	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	No further modification is 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. 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.		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.	
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	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
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB8	Object to housing proposals. Central Government has issued guidance for local councils to protect the Green Belt but this is not being followed by WBC. The GBBR is flawed and does not consider a number of other factors when considering Mayford for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 10.0.  As noted within the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in identifying sites within the Green Belt for development needs. The constrains of the Borough, including flood zones and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have also been taken into account in the site identification process. More information can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB9	Object to housing proposals. Central Government has issued guidance for local councils to protect the Green Belt but this is not being followed by WBC. The GBBR is flawed and does not consider a number of other factors when considering Mayford for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 10.0.  As noted within the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in identifying sites within the Green Belt for development needs. The constrains of the Borough, including flood zones and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have also been taken into account in the site identification process. More information can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB10	Object to housing proposals. Central Government has issued guidance for local councils to protect the Green Belt but this is not being followed by WBC. The GBBR is flawed and does not consider a number of other factors when considering Mayford for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 10.0.  As noted within the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in identifying sites within the Green Belt for development needs. The constrains of the Borough, including flood zones and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have also been taken into account in the site identification process. More information can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB11	Object to housing proposals. Central Government has issued guidance for local councils to protect the Green Belt but this is not being followed by WBC. The GBBR is flawed and does not consider a number of other factors when considering Mayford for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 10.0.  As noted within the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in identifying sites within the Green Belt for development needs. The constrains of the Borough, including flood zones and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have also been taken into account in the site identification process. More information can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1616	Robert, Susan Beckett Clark	Clark	GB14	Object to housing proposals. Central Government has issued guidance for local councils to protect the Green Belt but this is not being followed by WBC. The GBBR is flawed and does not consider a number of other factors when considering Mayford for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 10.0. As noted within the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in identifying sites within the Green Belt for development needs. The constrains of the Borough, including flood zones and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have also been taken into account in the site identification process. More information can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). It should be noted that site GB14 is not proposed for development but for Green Infrastructure purposes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
758	Christina	Clarke	General	No investments in facilities/infrastructure to benefit existing residents let alone new ones.	None stated.	The representation does not state the area of the Borough referred to. Nevertheless, the representation regarding infrastructure provision has been 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
758	Christina	Clarke	General	No investments in facilities/infrastructure to benefit existing residents let alone new ones.	None stated.	The representation does not state the area of the Borough referred to. Nevertheless, the representation regarding infrastructure provision has been 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	No further modification is 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.	
758	Christina	Clarke	General	There are no investments planned in facilities and infrastructure to benefit existing residents. For example there is no full time library, community centre, leisure centre or medical facilities.	None stated.	The representation does not state the area of the Borough referred to. Nevertheless, the representation regarding infrastructure provision has been 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
758	Christina	Clarke	General	There are no investments planned in facilities and infrastructure to benefit existing residents. For example there is no full time library, community centre, leisure centre or medical facilities.	None stated.	The representation does not state the area of the Borough referred to. Nevertheless, the representation regarding infrastructure provision has been 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
758	Christina	Clarke	General	There are no investments planned in facilities and infrastructure to benefit existing residents. For example there is no full time library, community centre, leisure centre or medical facilities.	None stated.	The representation does not state the area of the Borough referred to. Nevertheless, the representation regarding infrastructure provision has been 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.			
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mavford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	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. With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.  The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified	No further modification is 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 relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main road and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.		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.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.  The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse	No further modification is 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. 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.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdeshott 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development of Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5  The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0The 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. 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. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.		<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> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	<p>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. 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.In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape 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 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> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape</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/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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  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.	No further modification is 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 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.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for this reason.	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	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. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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.	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.  Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				vehicle.		<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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 road can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>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 the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated</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, 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.	
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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 road can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>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 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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 road 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. 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The road can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>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 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to	Do not include this site in the	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	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
				confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	DPD.	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.	of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
1227	Andrew	Clarke	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
725	Kirsty	Clarke-ol	General	Current road infrastructure isn't coping and more housing will make it worse in Byfleet. Village shouldn't have a rush hour that takes 15 minutes to go less than a mile.	Byfleet green belt shouldn't be touched	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse 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.	
725	Kirsty	Clarke-ol	General	Green Belt should be preserved and development should take place on brownfield sites.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The Council has considered a number of existing sites in the urban area. The DPD is proposing to allocate over 50 sites on brownfield land. This issue has also been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
725	Kirsty	Clarke-ol	General	Green Belt should be preserved. Local road infrastructure can not cope with already.	Look at other areas in Woking borough brown site village green belts will be persevered.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The Council has considered a number of existing sites in the urban area. The DPD is proposing to allocate over 50 sites on brownfield land. This issue has also been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.  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
725	Kirsty	Clarke-ol	General	Other brown belt sites	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The Council has considered a number of existing sites in the urban area. The DPD is proposing to allocate over 50 sites on brownfield land. This issue has also been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
12	Andrew	Clayton	GB12	<p>A wholly inappropriate site to develop. Firstly on the basis of local infrastructure; the road system can not cope with additional traffic and would require extensive (prohibitive modification), the school in Pyrford is already full, parking for the school is chaotic and dangerous already, additional houses at GB12 and GB13 irresponsible, whilst close to shops on Marshall Parade it is hard to park there, the West Byfleet doctors surgery is full, and sewage and water systems are old and at capacity already.</p> <p>Secondly, this site was previously subject of a planning application which led to a public meeting and enquiry with Woking Council objecting to the application. What has changed this time round. Pressure from the land owner who wants to sell this land and make a profit, leaving local residents to be impacted for years to come. Whoever thinks this a suitable site is at best misinformed and at worst negligent. This site is not supported by the Pyrford Forum's plans.</p>	Simple remove it !	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The 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
12	Andrew	Clayton	GB13	<p>A wholly inappropriate site to develop. Firstly on the basis of local infrastructure; the road system can not cope with additional traffic and would require extensive (prohibitive modification), the school in Pyrford is already full, parking for the school is chaotic and dangerous already, additional houses at GB12 and GB13 irresponsible, whilst close to shops on Marshall Parade it is hard to park there, the West Byfleet doctors surgery is full, and sewage and water systems are old and at capacity already. Secondly, this site was previously subject of a planning application which led to a public meeting and enquiry with Woking Council objecting to the application. What has changed this time round. Pressure from the land owner who wants to sell this land and make a profit, leaving local residents to be impacted for years to come. Whoever thinks this a suitable site is at best misinformed and at worst negligent. This site is not supported by the Pyrford Forum's plans.</p>	Remove it.	<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 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.</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
12	Andrew	Clayton	General	The wider infrastructure around Pyrford is beyond capacity road system, schools, sewage, water etc.; removing land from the Green Belt at sites GB12 and 13 is wholly unacceptable and should be removed from the development plan immediately.	Remove sites GB12 and 13 from the development plan immediately.	The principle of allocation Green Belt land for development including Site GB12 and GB13 has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The Council will seek to ensure that the proposed development is supported by adequate infrastructure. The manner that infrastructure has been identified to support the allocations 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
1386	J	Clements	GB12	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads.	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
1386	J	Clements	GB13	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads.	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
1386	J	Clements	GB15	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads.	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
1386	J	Clements	GB16	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about: parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads; and the poor condition of Parvis Road and Old Woking Road, and the impact extra traffic will have in worsening this problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA50	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about: parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads; and the poor condition of Parvis Road and Old Woking Road, and the impact extra traffic will have in worsening this problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA51	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about: parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads; and the poor condition of Parvis Road and Old Woking Road, and the impact extra traffic will have in worsening this problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA52	Objects to the proposals, due to the impact of the massive influx of people on traffic in the area, particularly at peak times. Also concerned about: parking for parents dropping children to school on Oakcroft and Sheerwater Roads; and the poor condition of Parvis Road and Old Woking Road, and the impact extra traffic will have in worsening this problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB12	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB13	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB15	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB16	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA50	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA51	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1386	J	Clements	UA52	Questions who the new houses are for and why should we be allowing traveller pitches?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8, and Sections 4.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB12	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	GB13	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	GB15	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	GB16	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	UA50	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	UA51	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	UA52	Chose to live in the area due to its excellent facilities in terms of medical care, shopping and transport links. This is going to change, and definitely not for the better.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. With regard to medical 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
1386	J	Clements	GB12	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 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.	
1386	J	Clements	GB13	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB15	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	GB16	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA50	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA51	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1386	J	Clements	UA52	Health services are already overloaded and will be unable to cope . There will be disruption ('total lock down') when building work starts and infrastructure is put in (sewerage pipes, electricity, gas and telephone cabling).	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. This representation is further addressed, with regard to general infrastructure provision, in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Despite Council and Environment Agency assurances, local people see the West Hall site floods extensively every year. Drainage may be a problem due to nearby Wey Canal and the M25. The Council are more interested in getting the reply they require, rather than asking the right questions. Should look into this in more detail.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies including flood risk assessment as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper to inform the DPD. They collective justifies the allocation of West Hall. The flooding implications of the proposal is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The key requirements of the proposal will ensure that flood risk issues of the site are appropriately addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	We understood that this proposal allows for a total of 600 parking spaces within the two sites. Most households have between 2 and 3 cars, some 1000 cars parked on road in these developments. Join the real world and accept the car is here to stay; make suitable provision for it.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	We understood that this proposal allows for a total of 600 parking spaces within the two sites. Most households have between 2 and 3 cars, some 1000 cars parked on road in these developments. Join the real world and accept the car is here to stay; make suitable provision for it.	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
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	The Council confirmed that West Byfleet Medical Centre would be able to assimilate the new patients onto their lists, contrary to my personal experience of waiting for 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
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Possible application for 900 pupil school along Parvis Road - at Broad oaks. A school may well be required if developments proceed as existing shortage of school places. Traffic from such a School would be considerable. We were told this would be considered as a separate application so need not examine this now; an attempt to fudge the issue. Proper planning must involve services and infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation 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
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Traffic density will increase to a point where flow will breakdown and extensive queuing result, negatively effecting those commuting to work or school. Business will suffer. Question the purpose of employment and mixed use at West Hall; there is available office space in Addlestone and Brooklands.	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
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Traffic density will increase to a point where flow will breakdown and extensive queuing result, negatively effecting those commuting to work or school. Business will suffer. Question the purpose of employment and mixed use at West Hall; there is available office space in Addlestone and Brooklands.	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
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Only a body with its head firmly buried in the sand would contemplate such an extensive development without greater thought as to how these could be resolved. The whole scheme lacks cohesion, everything dealt with piece meal. Wider problems should be considered. Scheme should not have been public until more detailed plans available. Consequently the public meeting did not engage with affected residents in a realistic manner, the Council just gave information. I am sending a copy of this letter to my M.P. and the Secretary of State [officer note - copies attached of covering letters to the Secretary of State for Transport and to Jonathan Lord MP].	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the DPD has been prepared in accordance with all legal and procedural requirement including the extent of consultation on the DPD. The Council has consulted widely on the DPD and will also give a further opportunity for the public to comment on a final version of the DPD before it is submitted for examination. The details of the extent of consultation undertaken is set out in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Only a body with its head firmly buried in the sand would contemplate such an extensive development without greater thought as to how these could be resolved. The whole scheme lacks cohesion, everything dealt with piece meal. Wider problems should be considered. Scheme should not have been public until more detailed plans available. Consequently the public meeting did not engage with affected residents in a realistic manner, the Council just gave information. I am sending a copy of this letter to my M.P. and the Secretary of State [officer note - copies attached of covering letters to the Secretary of State for Transport and to Jonathan Lord MP].	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the DPD has been prepared in accordance with all legal and procedural requirement including the extent of consultation on the DPD. The Council has consulted widely on the DPD and will also give a further opportunity for the public to comment on a final version of the DPD before it is submitted for examination. The details of the extent of consultation undertaken is set out in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Increased traffic on Parvis Road will delay those joining from side road, particularly Pyrford Road and Coldharbour Road which already back up. Neither will cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Increased traffic on Parvis Road will delay those joining from side road, particularly Pyrford Road and Coldharbour Road which already back up. Neither will cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	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
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Woking Borough Council is responding to a Central Government by building nearly half the additional dwellings in West Byfleet, without regard to infrastructural problems or the social effects on existing residents. There is some spare land, the owners are prepared to sell, let's grab it. The plan would involve reduction of Green Belt by 85/90%, unnecessary as there are other available sites more equitably distributed. Development will impact natural habitat. Your representative meeting was following the Council line and not objective. There is acute lack of facts.	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. 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. The Council is aware of the value attached to the Green Belt by residents. This applied to every bit of Green Belt land. However, the Council also has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. Overall, the proposal in the DPD will remove about 3.46% of the total Green Belt land in the Borough up to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Woking Borough Council is responding to a Central Government by building nearly half the additional dwellings in West Byfleet, without regard to infrastructural problems or the social effects on existing residents. There is some spare land, the owners are prepared to sell, let's grab it. The plan would involve reduction of Green Belt by 85/90%, unnecessary as there are other available sites more equitably distributed. Development will impact natural habitat. Your representative meeting was following the Council line and not objective. There is acute lack of facts.	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. 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. The Council is aware of the value attached to the Green Belt by residents. This applied to every bit of Green Belt land. However, the Council also has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. Overall, the proposal in the DPD will remove about 3.46% of the total Green Belt land in the Borough up to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	The Council's suggestion that a roundabout at the West Hall entrance would do nothing to improve traffic flow along the Parvis Road and would make it worse. Journey times can be long.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	The Council's suggestion that a roundabout at the West Hall entrance would do nothing to improve traffic flow along the Parvis Road and would make it worse. Journey times can be long.	None stated.	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
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Traffic flow along the Parvis Road (A245) is 61% greater than its theoretical capacity. The development would increase traffic on this. The Council insists development would not breach the current level of service but the "F" rating is the worst category. The Council is ignoring are further worsening to justify development. Question why recent surveys since similar survey in the late 1990's found there was no possibility of traffic flow being improved. The Secretary of State determined that there should be no further development at Broad oaks until Parvis Road was improved. No improvements have been made since.	None stated.	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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Traffic flow along the Parvis Road (A245) is 61% greater than its theoretical capacity. The development would increase traffic on this. The Council insists development would not breach the current level of service but the "F" rating is the worst category. The Council is ignoring are further worsening to justify development. Question why recent surveys since similar survey in the late 1990's found there was no possibility of traffic flow being improved. The Secretary of State determined that there should be no further development at Broad oaks until Parvis Road was improved. No improvements have been made since.	None stated.	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 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	No further modification is 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. 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. The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3 respectively.	
189	Peter	Clint	GB12	Broad oaks and West Hall are unable to cope with such large developments given insurmountable problems. One or other site could be used for a much smaller development but still traffic concerns. Roads also inadequate in Pyrford. West Byfleet and Pyrford can not accommodate large development without flattening and radical, expensive redesign. The Council's reports make it clear there is no way traffic on Parvis Road can be improved. This is not West Byfleet rejecting any local development, need to be realistic. Solutions must be found before further consultation.	None stated.	Broad oaks is already designated as a Major Developed site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. This is a proposal that could have come forward since the adoption of the Core Strategy but have failed to do so. The Site Allocations DPD on seeks to expand the proposed uses on the site to include residential and elderly people accommodation. The West Hall site has been identified for allocation to contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough. It is a sustainable site when compared against other reasonable alternatives. 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 issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	Broad oaks and West Hall are unable to cope with such large developments given insurmountable problems. One or other site could be used for a much smaller development but still traffic concerns. Roads also inadequate in Pyrford. West Byfleet and Pyrford can not accommodate large development without flattening and radical, expensive redesign. The Council's reports make it clear there is no way traffic on Parvis Road can be improved. This is not West Byfleet rejecting any local development, need to be realistic. Solutions must be found before further consultation.	None stated.	Broad oaks is already designated as a Major Developed site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. This is a proposal that could have come forward since the adoption of the Core Strategy but have failed to do so. The Site Allocations DPD on seeks to expand the proposed uses on the site to include residential and elderly people accommodation. The West Hall site has been identified for allocation to contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough. It is a sustainable site when compared against other reasonable alternatives. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						has 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 issues of the area.	
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	Broad oaks and West Hall are unable to cope with such large developments given insurmountable problems. One or other site could be used for a much smaller development but still traffic concerns. Roads also inadequate in Pyrford. West Byfleet and Pyrford can not accommodate large development without flattening and radical, expensive redesign. The Council's reports make it clear there is no way traffic on Parvis Road can be improved. This is not West Byfleet rejecting any local development, need to be realistic. Solutions must be found before further consultation.	None stated.	Broad oaks is already designated as a Major Developed site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. This is a proposal that could have come forward since the adoption of the Core Strategy but have failed to do so. The Site Allocations DPD on seeks to expand the proposed uses on the site to include residential and elderly people accommodation. The West Hall site has been identified for allocation to contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough. It is a sustainable site when compared against other reasonable alternatives. 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 issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB13	Broad oaks and West Hall are unable to cope with such large developments given insurmountable problems. One or other site could be used for a much smaller development but still traffic concerns. Roads also inadequate in Pyrford. West Byfleet and Pyrford can not accommodate large development without flattening and radical, expensive redesign. The Council's reports make it clear there is no way traffic on Parvis Road can be improved. This is not West Byfleet rejecting any local development, need to be realistic. Solutions must be found before further consultation.	None stated.	Broad oaks is already designated as a Major Developed site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. This is a proposal that could have come forward since the adoption of the Core Strategy but have failed to do so. The Site Allocations DPD only seeks to extend the uses on the site to include residential development. The Council's evidence supports the allocation of West Hall will make a significant contribution towards meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 20 and 3. 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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
189	Peter	Clint	GB16	<p>I understand Woking Borough Council engaged Peter Brett Associates to evaluate potential Green Belt land. The Council gave only cursory attention to use of brown field sites; assessment by in house staff unable to be independent and lacking expertise. The Council has slanted its search for sites to Green Belt, far more attractive to the bottom line for developers.</p> <p>The Council is indifferent to the wishes of residents and Central Government. I have requested an independent review of the circumstance leading to the production of the Plan.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is not indifferent to the representations made by local residents. However, it needs to balance that with its clear responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as set out in the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
189	Peter	Clint	GB15	<p>I understand Woking Borough Council engaged Peter Brett Associates to evaluate potential Green Belt land. The Council gave only cursory attention to use of brown field sites; assessment by in house staff unable to be independent and lacking expertise. The Council has slanted its search for sites to Green Belt, far more attractive to the bottom line for developers. The Council is indifferent to the wishes of residents and Central Government. I have requested an independent review of the circumstance leading to the production of the Plan.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The 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 Council has not ignore the concerns of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as established in the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1683	David	Clinton	General	Supports a proposal to develop the site.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	Clearly there is a need for more housing, particularly affordable housing and housing for the elderly. Smaller developments would be more appropriate as they could be more easily accommodated within the existing village and community. Cramming this large number of small houses in will ruin the character of the village, and will not provide a pleasant environment of residents of those houses.	Smaller developments would be more appropriate as they could be more easily accommodated within the existing village and community.	<p>The proposed homes will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. This includes standards for internal and outdoor amenity space (gardens). In terms of the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford, this is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	Clearly there is a need for more housing, particularly affordable housing and housing for the elderly. Smaller developments would be more appropriate as they could be more easily accommodated within the existing village and community. Cramming this large number of small houses in will ruin the character of the village, and will not provide a pleasant environment of residents of those houses.	Smaller developments would be more appropriate as they could be more easily accommodated within the existing village and community.	<p>The proposed homes will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. This includes standards for internal and outdoor amenity space (gardens). In terms of the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford, this is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	Losing the fields would cause loss of a lot of natural habitats for wildlife.	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 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</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 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).	
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	Losing the fields would cause loss of a lot of natural habitats for wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	Coldharbour Lane and the main road through the village are already very congested, particularly at school drop off and pick up times, and the proposals would worsen this and potentially make the road dangerous. Looking more widely, major development at Wisley will increase traffic through Pyrford, and cause problems on narrow, single lane road that are not designed for heavy 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
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	Coldharbour Lane and the main road through the village are already very congested, particularly at school drop off and pick up times, and the proposals would worsen this and potentially make the road dangerous. Looking more widely, major development at Wisley will increase traffic through Pyrford, and cause problems on narrow, single lane road that are not designed for heavy 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
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	There is not capacity at the local school and in nurseries and pre-schools to cope with the additional 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
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	There is not capacity at the local school and in nurseries and pre-schools to cope with the additional 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
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	Does not believe the Council has taken representations of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum into account. The proposals are also contrary to the recommendations of the Council's independent advisors.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns. 7. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	Does not believe the Council has taken representations of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum into account. The proposals are also contrary to the recommendations of the Council's independent advisors.	None stated.	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. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns. 7. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	The village is a community where people want to live, because of its friendly, safe and pleasant semi-rural environment. The character and wide blend of facilities is something that once destroyed cannot be re-created.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	The village is a community where people want to live, because of its friendly, safe and pleasant semi-rural environment. The character and wide blend of facilities is something that once destroyed cannot be re-created.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB12	Objects to the proposals due to the impact on Pyrford's rural landscape, its footpaths and views, which are an important part of the village. It would be a great loss to lose these fields.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. Regarding footpaths and recreation opportunities, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1452	Alexandra	Clough	GB13	Objects to the proposals due to the impact on Pyrford's rural landscape, its footpaths and views, which are an important part of the village. It would be a great loss to lose these fields.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. Regarding footpaths and recreation opportunities, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
26	N F	Cobb	GB12	Loss of Green Belt land	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB13	Loss of Green Belt land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
26	N F	Cobb	GB15	Loss of Green Belt land	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB16	Loss of Green Belt land	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
26	N F	Cobb	GB12	Pyrford Church of England Primary School is over subscribed, have provisions been made for additional school places.	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB13	Pyrford Church of England Primary School is over subscribed, have provisions been made for additional school places.	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB15	Pyrford Church of England Primary School is over subscribed, have provisions been made for additional school places.	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB16	Pyrford Church of England Primary School is over subscribed, have provisions been made for additional school places.	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB12	Significant negative impact on the road network	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB13	Significant negative impact on the road network	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB15	Significant negative impact on the road network	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
26	N F	Cobb	GB16	Significant negative impact on the road network	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
516	Will	Cobley	Introduction	Outlines detail including the purpose of the document to allocate land to meet the Core Strategy's requirements. The Core Strategy's housing requirement is the minimum required during the plan period, and the allocations in this plan have the capacity to deliver only marginally above the minimum requirement. This does not represent objectively assessed need (OAN), and conflicts with para 14 of the NPPF as it neither allocates enough land to meet OAN or provides flexibility to adapt to rapid change. The document relies on delivery of housing from a small number of sites over the plan period, despite acknowledging that further sites suitable for development are identified through its safeguarding policies. There is clear evidence of urgent housing need in Woking borough and no justification for the Council to hold back the release of suitable land (including sites in the Green Belt) in the plan period simply because it may result in over delivery of the adopted Core Strategy housing requirement. This approach does not accord with the NPPF tests of soundness in being positively prepared, justified or effective.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Outlines detail including the purpose of the document to allocate land to meet the Core Strategy's requirements. The Core Strategy's housing requirement is the minimum required during the plan period, and the allocations in this plan have the capacity to deliver only marginally above the minimum requirement. This does not represent objectively assessed need (OAN), and conflicts with para 14 of the NPPF as it neither allocates enough land to meet OAN or provides flexibility to adapt to rapid change. The document relies on delivery of housing from a small number of sites over the plan period, despite acknowledging that further sites suitable for development are identified through its safeguarding policies. There is clear evidence of urgent housing need in Woking borough and no justification for the Council to hold back the release of suitable land (including sites in the Green Belt) in the plan period simply because it may result in over delivery of the adopted Core Strategy housing requirement. This approach does not accord with the NPPF tests of soundness in being positively prepared, justified or effective.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Outlines detail including the purpose of the document to allocate land to meet the Core Strategy's requirements. The Core Strategy's housing requirement is the minimum required during the plan period, and the allocations in this plan have the capacity to deliver only marginally above the minimum requirement. This does not represent objectively assessed need (OAN), and conflicts with para 14 of the NPPF as it neither allocates enough land to meet OAN or provides flexibility to adapt to rapid change. The document relies on delivery of housing from a small number of sites over the plan period, despite acknowledging that further sites suitable for development are identified through its safeguarding policies. There is clear evidence of urgent housing need in Woking borough and no justification for the Council to hold back the release of suitable land (including sites in the Green Belt) in the plan period simply because it may result in over delivery of the adopted Core Strategy	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is 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 requirement. This approach does not accord with the NPPF tests of soundness in being positively prepared, justified or effective.			
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	While supporting the recognition that this site is suitable for release from the Green Belt, there is no justification to delay its release until after 2027 in light of the site's immediate availability, clear and urgent need for housing and Core Strategy and NPPF objectives. Supports the housing capacity estimated for the site but highlights a number of constraints that will impact overall development costs. These include infrastructure and mitigation to address flood risk, traffic impact, drainage, tree coverage and connections to utilities. In light of this the policy should provide further flexibility in terms of affordable housing requirements, S106, CIL and infrastructure mitigation, to avoid the scheme becoming potentially unviable.	The policy should provide further flexibility in terms of affordable housing requirements, S106, CIL and infrastructure mitigation, to avoid the scheme becoming potentially unviable.	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. Based on the collective evidence of the Council, it is decided that land at West Hall (GB15) and land at Egley Road (GB8) should come forward to deliver the requirements of the Core Strategy up to 2027. The allocation of both sites allows scope to ensure that there is certainty in the trajectory of delivery to meet at least the housing requirement during that time. GB4 is safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027 when the site will be needed to meet development needs. It is important that development meets the requirements of the development plan for the area. It is also very important that development is supported by necessary infrastructure. The requirements of the allocation will enable these objectives to be achieved. The Core Strategy is informed by a viability assessment. The Council has also adopted CIL that is underpinned by an up to date viability assessment. The CIL tariff, which is mandatory makes allowance for Section 106 contributions that will be sought for items such as Affordable Housing and all the other policy requirements that are not covered by CIL. Beyond that the Core Strategy allows scope for an applicant to make a case based on evidence of viability if it is felt that the viability of a particular scheme is threatened. In this regard, the proposed suggestion is unnecessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	While supporting the recognition that this site is suitable for release from the Green Belt, there is no justification to delay its release until after 2027 in light of the site's immediate availability, clear and urgent need for housing and Core Strategy and NPPF objectives. The housing capacity estimated for the site (approx. 135 dwellings) is above the level suggested by our client's detailed site assessment (nearer 100 dwellings) which also highlights a number of constraints that will impact the overall viability of the development. These include flood risk, traffic impact, drainage, tree coverage, overhead power cables and connections to utilities. In light of this the policy should provide further flexibility in terms of affordable housing requirements, S106, CIL and infrastructure mitigation, to avoid the scheme becoming potentially unviable.	The policy should provide further flexibility in terms of affordable housing requirements, S106, CIL and infrastructure mitigation, to avoid the scheme becoming potentially unviable.	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. Based on the collective evidence of the Council, it is decided that land at West Hall (GB15) and land at Egley Road (GB8) should come forward to deliver the requirements of the Core Strategy up to 2027. The allocation of both sites allows scope to ensure that there is certainty in the trajectory of delivery to meet at least the housing requirement during that time. GB5 is safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027 when the site will be needed to meet development needs. It is important that development meets the requirements of the development plan for the area. It is also very important that development is supported by necessary infrastructure. The requirements of the allocation will enable these objectives to be achieved. The Core Strategy is informed by a viability assessment. The Council has also adopted CIL that is underpinned by an up to date viability assessment. The CIL tariff, which is mandatory makes allowance for Section 106 contributions that will be sought for items such as Affordable Housing and all the other policy requirements that are not covered by CIL. Beyond that the Core Strategy allows scope for an applicant to make a case based on evidence of viability if it is felt that the viability of a particular scheme is threatened. In this regard, the proposed suggestion is unnecessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Summarises points made in the representation: housing need in Woking is far higher than the adopted Core Strategy (CS) min. requirement; the CS Inspector stated sustainable sites should not be held back on the ground of exceeding the min. housing requirement; the Council's evidence recommend release of sustainable sites from the Green Belt; the land west of Byfleet sites are available for immediate development and in the context of urgent housing need the Council has failed to justify why these sites should not be released in the plan period; site specific policies for GB4 and Gb5 should provide greater flexibility in terms of social infrastructure and mitigation requirements to ensure that housing development on these sites remains viable and deliverable.	None stated.	Comment noted. Each site will be assessed with regard to viability at the planning application stage, however it is important to the Council that adequate local infrastructure is put in place. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a flat, non-negotiable charge. Provision of local infrastructure is part of the Key Requirements for the site, and is further detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Summarises points made in the representation: housing need in Woking is far higher than the adopted Core Strategy (CS) min. requirement; the CS Inspector stated sustainable sites should not be held back on the ground of exceeding the min. housing requirement; the Council's evidence recommend release of sustainable sites from the Green Belt; the land west of Byfleet sites are available for immediate development and in the context of urgent housing need the Council has failed to justify why these sites should not be released in the plan period; site specific policies for GB4 and Gb5 should provide greater flexibility in terms of social	None stated.	Comment noted. Each site will be assessed with regard to viability at the planning application stage, however it is important to the Council that adequate local infrastructure is put in place. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a flat, non-negotiable charge. Provision of local infrastructure is part of the Key Requirements for the site, and is further detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
				infrastructure and mitigation requirements to ensure that housing development on these sites remains viable and deliverable.			
516	Will	Cobley	Introduction	Summarises points made in the representation: housing need in Woking is far higher than the adopted Core Strategy (CS) min. requirement; the CS Inspector stated sustainable sites should not be held back on the ground of exceeding the min. housing requirement; the Council's evidence recommend release of sustainable sites from the Green Belt; the land west of Byfleet sites are available for immediate development and in the context of urgent housing need the Council has failed to justify why these sites should not be released in the plan period; site specific policies for GB4 and Gb5 should provide greater flexibility in terms of social infrastructure and mitigation requirements to ensure that housing development on these sites remains viable and deliverable.	None stated.	Comment noted. Each site will be assessed with regard to viability at the planning application stage, however it is important to the Council that adequate local infrastructure is put in place. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a flat, non-negotiable charge. Provision of local infrastructure is part of the Key Requirements for the site, and is further detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	SA1	Summarises points made in the representation: housing need in Woking is far higher than the adopted Core Strategy (CS) min. requirement; the CS Inspector stated sustainable sites should not be held back on the ground of exceeding the min. housing requirement; the Council's evidence recommend release of sustainable sites from the Green Belt; the land west of Byfleet sites are available for immediate development and in the context of urgent housing need the Council has failed to justify why these sites should not be released in the plan period; site specific policies for GB4 and Gb5 should provide greater flexibility in terms of social infrastructure and mitigation requirements to ensure that housing development on these sites remains viable and deliverable.	None stated.	Comment noted. Each site will be assessed with regard to viability at the planning application stage, however it is important to the Council that adequate local infrastructure is put in place. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a flat, non-negotiable charge. Provision of local infrastructure is part of the Key Requirements for the site, and is further detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	SA1	Contends that given the lack of capacity in urban areas, clear evidence of urgent need beyond the Core Strategy requirement and NPPF requirements for flexibility, there is a compelling case for allocation of further sites during the plan period. In the GBR option 1 gave the greatest flexibility in delivery options and would help 'boost significantly' the supply of housing in Woking'. There is no justification given for reserving sites GB4 and GB5 for later release, or reasoning as to why some sites are allocated and others safeguarded. The policy should be amended to include reference to allocation of these sites within the plan period, in order to meet a higher proportion of identified need now and comply with NPPF requirements for flexibility.	Policy SA1 should be amended to include specific reference to the allocation of our client's site during this plan period.	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. Based on the collective evidence of the Council, it is decided that land at West Hall (GB15) and land at Egley Road (GB8) should come forward to deliver the requirements of the Core Strategy up to 2027. The allocation of both sites allows scope to ensure that there is certainty in the trajectory of delivery to meet at least the housing requirement during that time. GB4 and GB4 are safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027 when the sites will be needed to meet development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Contends that given the lack of capacity in urban areas, clear evidence of urgent need beyond the Core Strategy requirement and NPPF requirements for flexibility, there is a compelling case for allocation of further sites during the plan period. In the GBR option 1 gave the greatest flexibility in delivery options and would help 'boost significantly' the supply of housing in Woking'. There is no justification given for reserving sites GB4 and GB5 for later release, or reasoning as to why some sites are allocated and others safeguarded. The policy should be amended to include reference to allocation of these sites within the plan period, in order to meet a higher proportion of identified need now and comply with NPPF requirements for flexibility.	Policy SA1 should be amended to include specific reference to the allocation of our client's site during this plan period.	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. Based on the collective evidence of the Council, it is decided that land at West Hall (GB15) and land at Egley Road (GB8) should come forward to deliver the requirements of the Core Strategy up to 2027. The allocation of both sites allows scope to ensure that there is certainty in the trajectory of delivery to meet at least the housing requirement during that time. GB4 and GB4 are safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027 when the sites will be needed to meet development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Contends that given the lack of capacity in urban areas, clear evidence of urgent need beyond the Core Strategy requirement and NPPF requirements for flexibility, there is a	Policy SA1 should be amended to	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. Based on the collective evidence of the Council, it is decided that land at West Hall	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				compelling case for allocation of further sites during the plan period. In the GBR option 1 gave the greatest flexibility in delivery options and would help 'boost significantly' the supply of housing in Woking'. There is no justification given for reserving sites GB4 and GB5 for later release, or reasoning as to why some sites are allocated and others safeguarded. The policy should be amended to include reference to allocation of these sites within the plan period, in order to meet a higher proportion of identified need now and comply with NPPF requirements for flexibility.	include specific reference to the allocation of our client's site during this plan period.	(GB15) and land at Egley Road (GB8) should come forward to deliver the requirements of the Core Strategy up to 2027. The allocation of both sites allows scope to ensure that there is certainty in the trajectory of delivery to meet at least the housing requirement during that time. GB4 and GB4 are safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027 when the sites will be needed to meet development needs.	
516	Will	Cobley	General	For the Site Allocations Plan to be found sound it is critical for the Council's chosen strategy to be informed by a rigorous Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to confirm it is the most appropriate strategy when assessed against reasonable alternatives. Not all reasonable alternatives have been tested in arriving at the Council's preferred strategy e.g. testing the chosen strategy of safeguarding Green Belt land versus comprehensive release of all sites in the current plan period to objectively assess the sustainability merits of both. Aligned to this is the issue about how the Council has selected its preferred approach for Green Belt release in the plan period, as the SA does not justify why certain sites were selected ahead of others, or why options put forward in the Green Belt were rejected. This is a fundamental flaw, as there is no evidence to show the preferred approach is the most sustainable (when tested against reasonable alternatives) and that the result is fair and transparent. This make the plan's strategy fundamentally unsound as it fails the justified and effective NPPF tests, and is also contrary to SA/SEA regulations.	None stated.	Section 11 of the SA report sets out the methodology following in carrying out the SA. In accordance with the SA methodology the Council has assessed all reasonable alternative sites. Any additional site submitted during the Regulation 18 consultation has also been assessed. The Council is satisfied that all reasonable alternatives have been appraised. Section 15 of the report lists the reasons why sites are either selected or rejected. The Council does not think that a sustainability appraisal will be needed to consider alternatives to the set safeguarding policy be it 13 years or less or more.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	Introduction	Outlines the urgency of housing need in the Borough, in relation to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) figures at the Core Strategy (CS) examination and the draft updated SHMA (Dec 2014), which shows OAN to be significantly higher than the 292 dpa requirement set in the CS. This target was accepted by the CS Inspector in the absence of a Green Belt Review, meaning there was no evidence available to confirm if land could reasonably be released from the Green Belt to help meet a higher level of identified need. The Inspector was clear that housing delivery to 2027 can exceed the minimum figure stated in the CS, and in the context of need contends that it is wrong that the DPD is focused on only meeting the minimum housing requirement. There is no reason for these sites to be held back, and the approach is preventing sustainable sites coming forward in the context of severe housing need.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Outlines the urgency of housing need in the Borough, in relation to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) figures at the Core Strategy (CS) examination and the draft updated SHMA (Dec 2014), which shows OAN to be significantly higher than the 292 dpa requirement set in the CS. This target was accepted by the CS Inspector in the absence of a Green Belt Review, meaning there was no evidence available to confirm if land could reasonably be released from the Green Belt to help meet a higher level of identified need. The Inspector was clear that housing delivery to 2027 can exceed the minimum figure stated in the CS, and in the context of need contends that it is wrong that the DPD is focused on only meeting the minimum housing requirement. There is no reason for these sites to be held	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is 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, and the approach is preventing sustainable sites coming forward in the context of severe housing need.			
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Outlines the urgency of housing need in the Borough, in relation to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) figures at the Core Strategy (CS) examination and the draft updated SHMA (Dec 2014), which shows OAN to be significantly higher than the 292 dpa requirement set in the CS. This target was accepted by the CS Inspector in the absence of a Green Belt Review, meaning there was no evidence available to confirm if land could reasonably be released from the Green Belt to help meet a higher level of identified need. The Inspector was clear that housing delivery to 2027 can exceed the minimum figure stated in the CS, and in the context of need contends that it is wrong that the DPD is focused on only meeting the minimum housing requirement. There is no reason for these sites to be held back, and the approach is preventing sustainable sites coming forward in the context of severe housing need.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has a specific objective to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy and not to address any perceived deficiencies of the housing requirement that is set in the Core Strategy. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. It has also identified land to be safeguarded to meet future development needs as advised in the NPPF (paragraph 85). The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification. It is important to note that because of the environmental constraints of the area, there are no other suitable sites that could be identified beyond the sites allocated or safeguarded in the DPD that can be released from the Green Belt without significantly undermining its overall purpose and integrity and or the landscape character and setting 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Taylor Wimpey Homes have commissioned detailed site assessment and masterplanning work to understand the opportunities and constraints of the site. Having considered matters such as flood risk, drainage, utilities, archaeology, highways capacity, trees, ecology, noise and services, the work confirms that the two parcels are suitable for housing development and could cumulatively accommodate about 185 dwellings, including a substantial proportion of affordable housing, significant green infrastructure, and local infrastructure improvements. The land is available immediately, subject to submission of a successful planning application.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Taylor Wimpey Homes have commissioned detailed site assessment and masterplanning work to understand the opportunities and constraints of the site. Having considered matters such as flood risk, drainage, utilities, archaeology, highways capacity, trees, ecology, noise and services, the work confirms that the two parcels are suitable for housing development and could cumulatively accommodate about 185 dwellings, including a substantial proportion of affordable housing, significant green infrastructure, and local infrastructure improvements. The land is available immediately, subject to submission of a successful planning application.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB4	Welcomes the acknowledgement in Policy SA1 for land released from the Green Belt, but questions the justification for delaying this until after 2027. The delay appears contrary to clear housing delivery objectives in the Core Strategy and NPPF. Furthermore the Council's strategy does not appear to be supported by clear evidence and is contrary to the advice provided in the GBR (2014).	None stated.	The Council have identified sufficient land in both the urban area and the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2027. The policy justification for the release of Green Belt land is already established in the Core Strategy and has been supported by the Secretary of State. The sites that are referred to are safeguarded sites. The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
516	Will	Cobley	GB5	Welcomes the acknowledgement in Policy SA1 for land released from the Green Belt, but questions the justification for delaying this until after 2027. The delay appears contrary to clear housing delivery objectives in the Core Strategy and NPPF. Furthermore the Council's strategy does not appear to be supported by clear evidence and is contrary to the advice provided in the GBR (2014).	None stated.	The Council have identified sufficient land in both the urban area and the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2027. The policy justification for the release of Green Belt land is already established in the Core Strategy and has been supported by the Secretary of State. The sites that are referred to are safeguarded sites. The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
516	Will	Cobley	SA1	Welcomes the acknowledgement in Policy SA1 for land released from the Green Belt, but questions the justification for delaying this until after 2027. The delay appears contrary to clear housing delivery objectives in the Core Strategy and NPPF. Furthermore the Council's strategy does not appear to be supported by clear evidence and is contrary to the advice provided in the GBR (2014).	None stated.	The Council have identified sufficient land in both the urban area and the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2027. The policy justification for the release of Green Belt land is already established in the Core Strategy and has been supported by the Secretary of State. The sites that are referred to are safeguarded sites. The NPPF provides clear guidance on safeguarded land. It requires the Plan to be clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. The Core Strategy has a period to 2027, and as such the restrictions on the release of safeguarded land is justification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Mayford has a very poor road network and poor bus connection. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night and there are few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. There is no road capacity for the scale of expansion proposed, and as outlined, the modelling of traffic impact undertaken seriously underestimates the considerable congestion the plans would create, should they 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. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network and poor bus connection. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night and there are few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. There is no road capacity for the scale of expansion proposed, and as outlined, the modelling of traffic impact undertaken seriously underestimates the considerable congestion the plans would create, should they 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. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network and poor bus connection. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night and there are few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. There is no road capacity for the scale of expansion proposed, and as outlined, the modelling of traffic impact undertaken seriously underestimates the considerable congestion the plans would create, should they 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. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network and poor bus connection. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night and there are few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. There is no road capacity for the scale of expansion proposed, and as outlined, the modelling of traffic impact undertaken seriously underestimates the considerable congestion the plans would create, should they 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. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network and poor bus connection. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night and there are few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. There is no road capacity for the scale of expansion proposed, and as outlined, the modelling of traffic impact undertaken seriously underestimates the considerable congestion the plans would create, should they 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. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	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. Further detail about planning adequate infrastructure is contained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	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. Further detail about planning adequate infrastructure is contained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	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. Further detail about planning adequate infrastructure is contained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	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. Further detail about planning adequate infrastructure is contained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	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. Further detail about planning adequate infrastructure is contained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	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
633	D	Cockburn	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
633	D	Cockburn	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
633	D	Cockburn	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
633	D	Cockburn	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Mayford is unique as a village, mentioned in the Domesday Book. This history should be protected rather than the area being consumed into urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Mayford is unique as a village, mentioned in the Domesday Book. This history should be protected rather than the area being consumed into urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Mayford is unique as a village, mentioned in the Domesday Book. This history should be protected rather than the area being consumed into urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Mayford is unique as a village, mentioned in the Domesday Book. This history should be protected rather than the area being consumed into urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Mayford is unique as a village, mentioned in the Domesday Book. This history should be protected rather than the area being consumed into urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Not convinced that the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for housing development, nor has this been independently verified.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Not convinced that the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for housing development, nor has this been independently verified.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Not convinced that the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for housing development, nor has this been independently verified.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Not convinced that the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for housing development, nor has this been independently verified.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Not convinced that the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for housing development, nor has this been independently verified.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Asks for clarification of the matters raised, explicitly: Does the transport document cover all the proposed housing out to 2040? The validation and calibration status of the mathematical model used to predict transport flows.	None stated.	It is confirmed that the three scenarios (Scenarios D, E and F) that were assessed as part of the Transport Assessment covered the period up to 2040. The included the sites allocated for development between 2022 and 2027 and safeguarded to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Asks for clarification of the matters raised, explicitly: Does the transport document cover all the proposed housing out to 2040? The validation and calibration status of the mathematical model used to predict transport flows.	None stated.	It is confirmed that the three scenarios (Scenarios D, E and F) that were assessed as part of the Transport Assessment covered the period up to 2040. The included the sites allocated for development between 2022 and 2027 and safeguarded to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Asks for clarification of the matters raised, explicitly: Does the transport document cover all the proposed housing out to 2040? The validation and calibration status of the mathematical model used to predict transport flows.	None stated.	It is confirmed that the three scenarios (Scenarios D, E and F) that were assessed as part of the Transport Assessment covered the period up to 2040. The included the sites allocated for development between 2022 and 2027 and safeguarded to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Asks for clarification of the matters raised, explicitly: Does the transport document cover all the proposed housing out to 2040? The validation and calibration status of the mathematical model used to predict transport flows.	None stated.	It is confirmed that the three scenarios (Scenarios D, E and F) that were assessed as part of the Transport Assessment covered the period up to 2040. The included the sites allocated for development between 2022 and 2027 and safeguarded to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased traffic on inadequate local road. It is dangerous to walk to Worplesdon station as there are no pavements, and the risk will worsen if the land is developed.	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 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased traffic on inadequate local road. It is dangerous to walk to Worplesdon station as there are no pavements, and the risk will worsen if the land is developed.	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 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased traffic on inadequate local road. It is dangerous to walk to Worplesdon station as there are no pavements, and the risk will worsen if the land is developed.	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 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased traffic on inadequate local road. It is dangerous to walk to Worplesdon station as there are no pavements, and the risk will worsen if the land is developed.	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 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Raises concern that the Greenbelt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment is flawed, and does not reflect reality. While the overall effect of scenario D may be small for Woking, the effect in Mayford would be huge. The outputs of the assessment contradict common sense, which mean something is probably wrong with the starting conditions. The base year (2005) for the model is not valid now, and thus not able to predict the future.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD. It was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Raises concern that the Greenbelt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment is flawed, and does not reflect reality. While the overall effect of scenario D may be small for Woking, the effect in Mayford would be huge. The outputs of the assessment contradict common sense, which mean something is probably wrong with the starting conditions. The base year (2005) for the model is not valid now, and thus not able to predict the future.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD. It was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Raises concern that the Greenbelt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment is flawed, and does not reflect reality. While the overall effect of scenario D may be small for Woking, the effect in Mayford would be huge. The outputs of the assessment contradict common sense, which mean something is probably wrong with the starting conditions. The base year (2005) for the model is not valid now, and thus not able to predict the future.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD. It was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Raises concern that the Greenbelt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment is flawed, and does not reflect reality. While the overall effect of scenario D may be small for Woking, the effect in Mayford would be huge. The outputs of the assessment contradict common sense, which mean something is probably wrong with the starting conditions. The base year (2005) for the model is not valid now, and thus not able to predict the future.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD. It was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Does not believe that 'exceptional' circumstances exist or have been proven to warrant the proposed changes to the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, paragraphs 1.1- 1.2 and 1.11-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Does not believe that 'exceptional' circumstances exist or have been proven to warrant the proposed changes to the Green Belt.	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. The Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs post 2027 and conformity with the NPPF has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Does not believe that 'exceptional' circumstances exist or have been proven to warrant the proposed changes to the Green Belt.	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. The Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs post 2027 and conformity with the NPPF has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Does not believe that 'exceptional' circumstances exist or have been proven to warrant the proposed changes to the Green Belt.	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. The Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs post 2027 and conformity with the NPPF has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Does not believe that 'exceptional' circumstances exist or have been proven to warrant the proposed changes to the Green Belt.	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. The Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs post 2027 and conformity with the NPPF has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI and is inappropriate for expansion due to the detrimental impact on wildlife and general recreation.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	If the safeguarded sites are included in the traffic assessment but ignored, the attempt to remove the sites from the Green Belt without this evidence is inappropriate. Housing on the safeguarded sites will lead to huge increases in traffic flow on Saunders Lane, which is omitted from the transport document. This is consistent with these areas not being considered in the modelling. If the sites are considered, the documents are inconsistent and unclear and do not form an adequate basis for public consultation or agreement at this stage.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	If the safeguarded sites are included in the traffic assessment but ignored, the attempt to remove the sites from the Green Belt without this evidence is inappropriate. Housing on the safeguarded sites will lead to huge increases in traffic flow on Saunders Lane, which is omitted from the transport document. This is consistent with these areas not being considered in the modelling. If the sites are considered, the documents are inconsistent and unclear and do not form an adequate basis for public consultation or agreement at this stage.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	If the safeguarded sites are included in the traffic assessment but ignored, the attempt to remove the sites from the Green Belt without this evidence is inappropriate. Housing on the safeguarded sites will lead to huge increases in traffic flow on Saunders Lane, which is omitted from the transport document. This is consistent with these areas not being considered in the modelling. If the sites are considered, the documents are inconsistent and unclear and do not form an adequate basis for public consultation or agreement at this stage.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	If the safeguarded sites are included in the traffic assessment but ignored, the attempt to remove the sites from the Green Belt without this evidence is inappropriate. Housing on the safeguarded sites will lead to huge increases in traffic flow on Saunders Lane, which is omitted from the transport document. This is consistent with these areas not being considered in the modelling. If the sites are considered, the documents are inconsistent and unclear and do not form an adequate basis for public consultation or agreement at this stage.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Concerned about the planning application for Hoe Valley School & Leisure Centre (PLAN/2015/0703) as the plans are not in keeping with the character of Mayford as a village, and considerable disadvantages will more than outweigh potential benefits for local residents.	None stated.	The proposal already 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	The transport assessment contains no evidence of calibration or validation, and is therefore suspect. Questions whether it meets any national standards for validity of transport mathematical modelling? As such a crucial part of the justification to permit Green Belt development in Mayford, it should at least be re-examined by specialists before its results are considered evidence to support the proposed changes.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD and has been carried out to all requisite standards. There is therefore no need for external validation of the study. The study was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	The transport assessment contains no evidence of calibration or validation, and is therefore suspect. Questions whether it meets any national standards for validity of transport mathematical modelling? As such a crucial part of the justification to permit Green Belt development in Mayford, it should at least be re-examined by specialists before its results are considered evidence to support the proposed changes.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD and has been carried out to all requisite standards. There is therefore no need for external validation of the study. The study was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	The transport assessment contains no evidence of calibration or validation, and is therefore suspect. Questions whether it meets any national standards for validity of transport mathematical modelling? As such a crucial part of the justification to permit Green Belt development in Mayford, it should at least be re-examined by specialists before its results are considered evidence to support the proposed changes.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD and has been carried out to all requisite standards. There is therefore no need for external validation of the study. The study was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	The transport assessment contains no evidence of calibration or validation, and is therefore suspect. Questions whether it meets any national standards for validity of transport mathematical modelling? As such a crucial part of the justification to permit Green Belt development in Mayford, it should at least be re-examined by specialists before its results are considered evidence to support the proposed changes.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Strategic Transport Assessment carried out by the County Council is sufficiently robust to inform the Site Allocations DPD and has been carried out to all requisite standards. There is therefore no need for external validation of the study. The study was completed in 2015 and is up to date. The Council has carried out the revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The assessment takes into account the proposed sites in Mayford. 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. It is clear from the Council's approach that there will be a further detailed transport assessment as part of the planning application process to inform any appropriate mitigation measures that might be required. This will also take into account any background information that would be relevant at the time. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Concerned about the impact on Smarts and Prey Heath, both important bird areas but does not understand why they are excluded from the Special Protection Area. Residents enjoy walking in these areas.	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. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The criteria for SPA designation is set by Natural England. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Concerned about the impact on Smarts and Prey Heath, both important bird areas but does not understand why they are excluded from the Special Protection Area. Residents enjoy walking in these areas.	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. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The criteria for SPA designation is set by Natural England. 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Concerned about the impact on Smarts and Prey Heath, both important bird areas but does not understand why they are excluded from the Special Protection Area. Residents enjoy walking in these areas.	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. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The criteria for SPA designation is set by Natural England. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Concerned about the impact on Smarts and Prey Heath, both important bird areas but does not understand why they are excluded from the Special Protection Area. Residents enjoy walking in these areas.	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. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The criteria for SPA designation is set by Natural England. 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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Concerned about the impact of traffic, pollution and noise out of school house and particular at weaken due to use of the Leisure Centre, on both Saunders Lane and the whole of	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is 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.			
633	D	Cockburn	General	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB14	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Has been made aware of the proposals that will have a significant detrimental impact on Mayford, so asks that the Council reconsider the plans. Some of the assumptions and modelling is seriously flawed which questions the validity of the conclusions.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  The Council considers its evidence base documents to be robust and up to date. The It is satisfied that the depth and breadth of evidence used to support the Core Strategy was comprehensive, robust and was able to withstand scrutiny at the Core Strategy Examination. The evidence, set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, is comprehensive enough to inform planning judgments about the preferred sites in the DPD. They have been prepared to high quality standards to meet all necessary requirements. Overall, Offices are satisfied that the DPD is adequately and appropriately informed by robust and up to date evidence base.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area - this argument is as relevant today.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process. Therefore, circumstances are quite different.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution to the Traveller community.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and potentially of Guildford, and would destroy the strong village community.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and potentially of Guildford, and would destroy the strong village community.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and potentially of Guildford, and would destroy the strong village community.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and potentially of Guildford, and would destroy the strong village community.	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
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Objects to the proposals as the documentation supplied is inconsistent and may not fully document the impact on traffic. It is unclear whether the traffic modelling in the Green Belt Boundary Review sensitivity test (scenario D) includes the significant additional housing proposed to the north east and north west of Saunders Lane, as safeguarded land between 2027 and 2040.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Objects to the proposals as the documentation supplied is inconsistent and may not fully document the impact on traffic. It is unclear whether the traffic modelling in the Green Belt Boundary Review sensitivity test (scenario D) includes the significant additional housing proposed to the north east and north west of Saunders Lane, as safeguarded land between 2027 and 2040.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Objects to the proposals as the documentation supplied is inconsistent and may not fully document the impact on traffic. It is unclear whether the traffic modelling in the Green Belt Boundary Review sensitivity test (scenario D) includes the significant additional housing proposed to the north east and north west of Saunders Lane, as safeguarded land between 2027 and 2040.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Objects to the proposals as the documentation supplied is inconsistent and may not fully document the impact on traffic. It is unclear whether the traffic modelling in the Green Belt Boundary Review sensitivity test (scenario D) includes the significant additional housing proposed to the north east and north west of Saunders Lane, as safeguarded land between 2027 and 2040.	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 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB7	Urges the Council to reconsider the plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent our views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB8	Urges the Council to reconsider the plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent our views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB9	Urges the Council to reconsider the plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent our views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
633	D	Cockburn	GB10	Urges the Council to reconsider the plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent our views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
633	D	Cockburn	GB11	Urges the Council to reconsider the plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent our views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The representor lives adjacent to the proposed sites. The vicinity to open space and the countryside is what drew them to live here.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The representor lives adjacent to the proposed sites. The vicinity to open space and the countryside is what drew them to live here.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	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 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	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 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	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 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	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 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	The proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath could wipe out wildlife in the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats 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
						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.	
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	The proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath could wipe out wildlife in the area	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	Development in the area will change the peaceful character of the area and may have an impact on house prices in the area	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	Development in the area will change the peaceful character of the area and may have an impact on house prices in the area	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	The main justification for the sites being allocated is the GBBR. The GBBR was not consulted on and is flawed including assessment of sustainability of the sites e.g. its location to local services and facilities.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0. In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD. 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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	The main justification for the sites being allocated is the GBBR. The GBBR was not consulted on and is flawed including assessment of sustainability of the sites e.g. its location to local services and facilities.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0.</p> <p>In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB14	The removal of GB14 for Green Infrastructure is not necessary as no change is planned. It is not an exceptional circumstance	None stated.	The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's infrastructure. More people will add more strain on transport infrastructure and there are no planned highways or rail improvements to address this. Problems are predicted for Egley Road, Prey Heath Road and around Worplesdon Station	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's infrastructure. More people will add more strain on transport infrastructure and there are no planned highways or rail improvements to address this. Problems are predicted for Egley Road, Prey Heath Road and around Worplesdon Station	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	The rural nature of the area should be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	The rural nature of the area should be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB10	The proposals do not take into consideration policy CS24 which requires developments to make a positive benefit to the landscape and townscape.	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
322	Janet	Cockrill	GB11	The proposals do not take into consideration policy CS24 which requires developments to make a positive benefit to the landscape and townscape.	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
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The representor lives adjacent to the proposed sites. The vicinity to open space and the countryside is what drew them to live here.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The representor lives adjacent to the proposed sites. The vicinity to open space and the countryside is what drew them to live here.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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	
323	John	Cockrill	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 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	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 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	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 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
323	John	Cockrill	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 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	The proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath could wipe out wildlife in the area	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
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	The proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath could wipe out wildlife in the area	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. 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
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	Development in the area will change the peaceful character of the area and may have an impact on house prices in the	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character 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
				area		landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	Development in the area will change the peaceful character of the area and may have an impact on house prices in the area	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	The main justification for the sites being allocated is the GBBR. The GBBR was not consulted on and is flawed including assessment of sustainability of the sites e.g. its location to local services and facilities.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0.</p> <p>In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>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
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	The main justification for the sites being allocated is the GBBR. The GBBR was not consulted on and is flawed including assessment of sustainability of the sites e.g. its location to local services and facilities.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0. In addition, the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD. 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
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the 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
323	John	Cockrill	GB14	The removal of GB14 for Green Infrastructure is not necessary as no change is planned. It is not an exceptional circumstance	None stated.	<p>The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground.</p> <p>Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's infrastructure. More people will add more strain on transport infrastructure and there are no planned highways or rail improvements to address this. Problems are predicted for Egley Road, Prey Heath Road and around Worplesdon Station	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
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's infrastructure. More people will add more strain on transport infrastructure and there are no planned highways or rail improvements to address this. Problems are predicted for Egley Road, Prey Heath Road	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</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 around Worplesdon Station		easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	The rural nature of the area should be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	The rural nature of the area should be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
323	John	Cockrill	GB10	The proposals do not take into consideration policy CS24 which requires developments to make a positive benefit to the landscape and townscape.	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
323	John	Cockrill	GB11	The proposals do not take into consideration policy CS24 which requires developments to make a positive benefit to the landscape and townscape.	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
1248	Vera	Coker	GB4	Parvis Road will be unusable, it is already blocked at rush hour.	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 road. 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
1248	Vera	Coker	GB5	Parvis Road will be unusable, it is already blocked at rush hour.	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 road. 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</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 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.	
1248	Vera	Coker	GB4	There insufficient infrastructure. There is Insufficient health provision- particular concern for the elderly. Local schools are at capacity. Roads are poor- improved drainage and road widening would be required.	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.  This representation regarding infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in 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
1248	Vera	Coker	GB5	There insufficient infrastructure. There is Insufficient health provision- particular concern for the elderly. Local schools are at capacity. Roads are poor- improved drainage and road widening would be required.	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.  This representation regarding infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in 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
1248	Vera	Coker	GB4	Local resident believes Byfleet will be spoilt as a result of the proposals. Objects to the use of GB land as there is other land available	Consider other available land	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
1248	Vera	Coker	GB5	Local resident believes Byfleet will be spoilt as a result of the proposals. Objects to the use of GB land as 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, 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
1552	S E	Cole	GB4	Adequate Health facilities and schools for all this extra Housing.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB5	Adequate Health facilities and schools for all this extra Housing.	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.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB4	Need to have 2 car parking spaces per property, not including garages. There is a lot of on street parking in the area.	None stated.	The Council agrees that new development should provide adequate parking provision. Parking provision for new development is noted in the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) whilst the design and integration of parking within a development scheme is set out in the Design SPD. As part of any detailed planning application, the Council will consult with the County Highways Authority (Surrey County Council) to ensure there is no adverse impact on highways safety and the wider road network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB5	Need to have 2 car parking spaces per property, not including garages. There is a lot of on street parking in the area.	None stated.	The Council agrees that new development should provide adequate parking provision. Parking provision for new development is noted in the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) whilst the design and integration of parking within a development scheme is set out in the Design SPD. As part of any detailed planning application, the Council will consult with the County Highways Authority (Surrey County Council) to ensure there is no adverse impact on highways safety and the wider road network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1552	S E	Cole	GB4	Enough green space for leisure for both existing and future residents.	None stated.	Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. In addition one of the key requirements for the site notes that the development must include a significant amount of green infrastructure including open space and landscaping on the western side of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB5	Enough green space for leisure for both existing and future residents.	None stated.	Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. In addition one of the key requirements for the site notes that the development must include a significant amount of green infrastructure including open space and landscaping on the south western corner of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB4	Concerned for proposals in Byfleet and surrounding area. Appreciate the need for homes and to meet government targets. Building in a flood plain area. Have proper plans been made for drainage and their management and maintenance as well as the rivers and canals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. The management and maintenance of rivers and canals is the responsibility of other organisations such as the Environment Agency and the Basingstoke Canal Authority. The Council has and will continue to work with these organisations to make sure they are maintained to minimise future flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB5	Concerned for proposals in Byfleet and surrounding area. Appreciate the need for homes and to meet government targets. Have proper plans been made for drainage and their management and maintenance as well as the rivers and canals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.  The management and maintenance of rivers and canals is the responsibility of other organisations such as the Environment Agency and the Basingstoke Canal Authority. The Council has and will continue to work with these organisations to make sure they are maintained to minimise future flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1552	S E	Cole	GB4	The only access road to and from the village is the A245, which is gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. 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
1552	S E	Cole	GB5	The only access road to and from the village is the A245, which is gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. The key requirements also note 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
						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.	
443	P	Coleing	GB7	The intensification of use on the traveller site will have an impact on the natural beauty.	None 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
443	P	Coleing	GB8	Object to proposals which will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking. Increasing the risk of coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB9	Object to proposals which will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking. Increasing the risk of coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB10	Object to proposals which will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking. Increasing the risk of coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB11	Object to proposals which will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking. Increasing the risk of coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB14	Object to proposals which will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking. Increasing the risk of coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB7	Historically, successive planning inspectors have refused permission here due to impact on the openness of the GB	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
443	P	Coleing	GB7	Object to GB7. Mayford already makes a significant contribution towards the number of traveller pitches, there's 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
443	P	Coleing	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
443	P	Coleing	GB8	No consideration has been given to preserving the character of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0</p> <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
443	P	Coleing	GB9	No consideration has been given to preserving the character of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0</p> <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
443	P	Coleing	GB10	No consideration has been given to preserving the character of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0. 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
443	P	Coleing	GB11	No consideration has been given to preserving the character of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0</p> <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
443	P	Coleing	GB14	No consideration has been given to preserving the character of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0</p> <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
443	P	Coleing	GB8	Concerned about Mayford's infrastructure. In particular the road infrastructure. The road are often congested and problems will intensify with new proposals.	Reconsider plans and the devastating impact they	<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</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 have on Mayford	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.	
443	P	Coleing	GB9	Concerned about Mayford's infrastructure. In particular the road infrastructure. The road are often congested and problems will intensify with new proposals.	Reconsider plans and the devastating impact they will have on Mayford	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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB10	Concerned about Mayford's infrastructure. In particular the road infrastructure. The road are often congested and problems will intensify with new proposals.	Reconsider plans and the devastating impact they will have on Mayford	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
443	P	Coleing	GB11	Concerned about Mayford's infrastructure. In particular the road infrastructure. The road are often congested and problems will intensify with new proposals.	Reconsider plans and the devastating impact they will have on Mayford	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
443	P	Coleing	GB14	Concerned about Mayford's infrastructure. In particular the road infrastructure. The road are often congested and problems will intensify with new proposals.	Reconsider plans and the devastating impact they will have on Mayford	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links 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
161	T	Collins	GB9	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, largely on traffic ground. Increased traffic in Prey Heath Road will increase risks for pedestrians, it is unlit and lacks footpaths. More traffic will worsen the situation, particularly through proposed development on Egley Road, used to access the Town Centre. We are neutral about the school and leisure facility proposed but there should be no significant housing development to avoid gridlock at peak times. We will be unable to support the commercial centre of Woking through shopping and leisure if would have to queue.	Please reconsider your 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 ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
161	T	Collins	GB10	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, largely on traffic ground. Increased traffic in Prey Heath Road will increase risks for pedestrians, it is unlit and lacks footpaths. More traffic will worsen the situation, particularly through proposed development on Egley Road, used to access the Town Centre. We are neutral about the school and leisure facility proposed but there should be no significant housing development to avoid gridlock at peak times. We will be unable to support the commercial centre of Woking through shopping and leisure if would have to queue.	Please reconsider your plans	The overall 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. Each proposal has specific key requirement to enable site specific impacts of any proposal that comes forward to be fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measure put in place to address any adverse impacts. The Council's 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 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. It should be noted that the school proposal now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
161	T	Collins	GB11	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, largely on traffic ground. Increased traffic in Prey Heath Road will increase risks for pedestrians, it is unlit and lacks footpaths. More traffic will worsen the situation, particularly through proposed development on Egley Road, used to access the Town Centre. We are neutral about the school and leisure facility proposed but there should be no significant housing development to avoid gridlock at peak times. We will be unable to support the commercial centre of Woking through shopping and leisure if would have to queue.	Please reconsider your plans	The overall 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. Each proposal has specific key requirement to enable site specific impacts of any proposal that comes forward to be fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measure put in place to address any adverse impacts. The Council's 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 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. It should be noted that the school proposal now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
161	T	Collins	GB8	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, largely on traffic ground. Increased traffic in Prey Heath Road will increase risks for pedestrians, it is unlit and	Please reconsider your plans	The overall 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. Each proposal has specific key requirement to enable site specific impacts of any	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				lacks footpaths. More traffic will worsen the situation, particularly through proposed development on Egley Road, used to access the Town Centre. We are neutral about the school and leisure facility proposed but there should be no significant housing development to avoid gridlock at peak times. We will be unable to support the commercial centre of Woking through shopping and leisure if would have to queue.		proposal that comes forward to be fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measure put in place to address any adverse impacts. The Council's 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 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. It should be noted that the school proposal now has planning permission.	
161	T	Collins	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and will be counterproductive by encouraging people to travel to Woking from Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. 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
161	T	Collins	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and will be counterproductive by encouraging people to travel to Woking from Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. 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. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
161	T	Collins	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and will be counterproductive by encouraging people to travel to Woking from Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. 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. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
161	T	Collins	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and will be counterproductive by encouraging people to travel to Woking from Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. 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. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
161	T	Collins	GB7	Concerned about increase in vehicles, particularly commercial, on Prey Heath Road. Unsafe for pedestrians. Pinch point of blind narrow bend over the bridge. Vehicles	Please reconsider your plans	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				regularly approach this too quickly.		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.	
161	T	Collins	GB7	I strongly object to increasing Traveller pitches on this land. The Mayford area already has sites at Burdeshott Road and Ten Acre Farm. No justification for further expansion in Mayford. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB12	The GB is important in preserving the views and providing a beautiful setting. A Government Inspector had previously suggested that the landscape above the Wey Valley was a key consideration in their decision not to remove these sites from the GB for development.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.  The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB13	The GB is important in preserving the views and providing a beautiful setting. A Government Inspector had previously suggested that the landscape above the Wey Valley was a key consideration in their decision not to remove these sites from the GB for development.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.  The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB12	Concerned about the environmental effect of removing land from the Green Belt	None stated.	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 development. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB13	Concerned about the environmental effect of removing land from the Green Belt	None stated.	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.	No further modification is 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 therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary development.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB12	The Green Belt serves an important function in providing access to the countryside for local residents. This has positive effects on the health and wellbeing of residents.	None stated.	This representation 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
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB13	The Green Belt serves an important function in providing access to the countryside for local residents. This has positive effects on the health and wellbeing of residents.	None stated.	This representation 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
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB12	Concerned that there is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate new houses in Pyrford. The existing highway network struggles, roads are often congested, there are frequent accidents, roads are not wide enough and are dangerous for cyclists. This is relevant to all parts of Pyrford, and it is therefore difficult to reach West Byfleet, Woodham, Old Woking, Maybury, Ripley and Wisley through Pyrford. The increase of traffic is a major factor that needs to be considered	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 Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshot 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
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB13	Concerned that there is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate new houses in Pyrford. The existing highway network struggles, roads are often congested, there are frequent accidents, roads are not wide enough and are dangerous for cyclists. This is relevant to all parts of Pyrford, and it is therefore difficult to reach West Byfleet, Woodham, Old Woking, Maybury, Ripley and Wisley through Pyrford. The increase of traffic is a major factor that needs to be considered	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 road. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB13	Historically there have been period of water shortage where restrictions were put in place.	Water supply needs to be increased	This representation 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
315	Yvonne	Collins	GB12	Historically there have been period of water shortage where restrictions were put in place.	Water supply needs to be increased	This representation 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
962	Stewart	Collins	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Proposed Wisley and Send developments will increase traffic levels. The Council have failed to determine the optimum housing expansion alternative proposal for Surrey and the wider region. The Council have not taken into account representations made by resident organisations. Current problems experienced by residents should be mitigated. Trains and station parking are already overcrowded, with no viable alternative public transport options.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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. The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7 to 3.11. As stated in 3.11, the Council is by no means suggesting that the approach it has taken to mitigate development impacts of the Site Allocations DPD will be a panacea to address deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision. Nevertheless, it will ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any future development are minimised. The Council, in preparing the Site Allocations DPD, has considered over 100 alternative sites for development within the Borough. This is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development needs. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing needs of local people. 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 Representor ID 19. The views of local residents are being considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. In addition, there is also opportunity to comment at the Regulation 19 consultation as well as the Examination in Public. The existing public transport provision 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. 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	No further modification is 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 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). South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.	
962	Stewart	Collins	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Proposed Wisley and Send developments will increase traffic levels. The Council have failed to determine the optimum housing expansion alternative proposal for Surrey and the wider region. The Council have not taken into account representations made by resident organisations. Current problems experienced by residents should be mitigated. Trains and station parking are already overcrowded, with no viable alternative public transport options.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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 impact of the proposed development on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7 to 3.11. As stated in 3.11, the Council is by no means suggesting that the approach it has taken to mitigate development impacts of the Site Allocations DPD will be a panacea to address deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision. Nevertheless, it will ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any future development are minimised. The Council, in preparing the Site Allocations DPD, has considered over 100 alternative sites for development within the Borough. This is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development needs. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing the housing needs of local people. 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 Representor ID 19. The views of local residents are being considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. In addition, there is also opportunity to comment at the Regulation 19 consultation as well as the Examination in Public. The existing public transport provision 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. 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	No further modification is 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 of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.	
962	Stewart	Collins	GB12	Remove parking charges in WTC. Remove cycle lanes and roadway obstructions. Ensure all private, commercial and infrastructure developments have adequate provision for the free flow of traffic by recognising the dependency on private cars.	Remove parking charges within Woking town centre	The Council note the representation and proposed modification to remove car parking charges in the Town Centre. Core Strategy Policy CS18 states that the majority of the trips in the Borough are taken by car, which results in congestion. This does not promote sustainable transport choices noted in the NPPF. The spatial vision of the Core Strategy is to create an integrated transport system that provides easy access to jobs, community facilities, green infrastructure and recreation by in particular, sustainable transport modes. By encouraging car parking within the Town Centre, this would increase the number of car journeys, congestion and not be consistent with the spatial vision of the Core Strategy. It would not result in the free flow of traffic as suggested. The representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
962	Stewart	Collins	GB13	Remove parking charges in WTC. Remove cycle lanes and roadway obstructions. Ensure all private, commercial and infrastructure developments have adequate provision for the free flow of traffic by recognising the dependency on private cars.	Remove parking charges within Woking town centre	The Council note the representation and proposed modification to remove car parking charges in the Town Centre. Core Strategy Policy CS18 states that the majority of the trips in the Borough are taken by car, which results in congestion. This does not promote sustainable transport choices noted in the NPPF. The spatial vision of the Core Strategy is to create an integrated transport system that provides easy access to jobs, community facilities, green infrastructure and recreation by in particular, sustainable transport modes. By encouraging car parking within the Town Centre, this would increase the number of car journeys, congestion and not be consistent with the spatial vision of the Core Strategy. It would not result in the free flow of traffic as suggested. The representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
962	Stewart	Collins	General	Remove parking charges in WTC. Remove cycle lanes and roadway obstructions. Ensure all private, commercial and infrastructure developments have adequate provision for the free flow of traffic by recognising the dependency on private	Remove parking charges within Woking town	The Council note the representation and proposed modification to remove car parking charges in the Town Centre. Core Strategy Policy CS18 states that the majority of the trips in the Borough are taken by car, which results in congestion. This does not promote sustainable transport choices noted in the NPPF. The spatial vision of the Core Strategy is to create an integrated transport system that provides easy access to jobs, community facilities, 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
				cars.	centre	infrastructure and recreation by in particular, sustainable transport modes. By encouraging car parking within the Town Centre, this would increase the number of car journeys, congestion and not be consistent with the spatial vision of the Core Strategy. It would not result in the free flow of traffic as suggested. The representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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.	
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	Important to keep accessible to community facilities. Tags Lane is used to access the Youth Club on foot. The field is used for parking for village events.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposal requires improved provision and connectivity to existing informal and formal open space. Where Core Strategy Policy CS17 supports the protection and enhancement of public rights of way to open space and Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	Important to keep accessible to community facilities. Tags Lane is used to access the Youth Club on foot. The field is used for parking for village events.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposal requires improved provision and connectivity to existing informal and formal open space. Where Core Strategy Policy CS17 supports the protection and enhancement of public rights of way to open space and Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	The road network is narrow and 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 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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	The road network is narrow and 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 transports studies prepared by Surrey County	No further modification is 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 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 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. 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>	
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	It would be essential to widen Upshot Lane to allow for at least one footpath.	None stated.	<p>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. 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 Upshot 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
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	It would be essential to widen Upshot Lane to allow for at least one footpath.	None stated.	<p>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. 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 Upshot 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</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
						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.	
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	Due to infilling and housing development the local infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	Due to infilling and housing development the local infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	People move here as Pyrford is a village with visible green fields. Development will alter the character of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	People move here as Pyrford is a village with visible green fields. Development will alter the character of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0 There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB12	Why cramp this area when there are other big areas of land in England. Questions why the land the other side of Sandy Lane not being considered.	Consider the land the other side of Sandy lane which would be away and out of view.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 17.0  The representation suggests an alternative site for consideration. The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
999	Sheila	Collins	GB13	Why cramp this area when there are other big areas of land in England. Questions why the land the other side of Sandy Lane not being considered.	Consider the land the other side of Sandy lane which would be away and out of view.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 17.0  The representation suggests an alternative site for consideration. The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	Will utilities be able to cope with the additional households? (electricity, water, gas). Existing infrastructure is aging, or are recent works to prepare for the new developments with further disruptions planned?	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	Will utilities be able to cope with the additional households? (electricity, water, gas). Existing infrastructure is aging, or are recent works to prepare for the new developments with further disruptions planned?	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
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	It is already difficult to arrange a doctor's appointment, services will not cope with additional demand. Local hospitals struggle with staff shortages and over loading. Other emergency services already stretched (ambulances, fire).	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	It is already difficult to arrange a doctor's appointment, services will not cope with additional demand. Local hospitals struggle with staff shortages and over loading. Other emergency services already stretched (ambulances, fire).	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
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	Local amenities are insufficient to meet the needs of this population increase - supermarkets, internet shopping will increase traffic and congestion, Woking has extortionate parking charges, carting shopping home on the bus is no joy and time consuming.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. 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. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The 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.	
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	Local amenities are insufficient to meet the needs of this population increase - supermarkets, internet shopping will increase traffic and congestion, Woking has extortionate parking charges, carting shopping home on the bus is no joy and time consuming.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. 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. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The 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
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	The leaflet circulated mentioned another school - who will this cater for? Does this mean taking more Green Belt?	None stated.	A planning application for a secondary school has now been approved at land at Egley Road (Site GB8).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	The leaflet circulated mentioned another school - who will this cater for? Does this mean taking more Green Belt?	None stated.	The proposal for a school at site GB8 now has the benefit of planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	I trust these developments are not a fait accompli and public opinion is not ignored. It will be a travesty to develop these beautiful fields. The infrastructure cannot cope now. Precious Green Belt will be used. It will blight the human population but also fauna and flora. Find somewhere else that is better suited and an environment that will cope.	None stated.	The Council values the views of the community and this exercise is a demonstration of how it is responding to the representations to the Regulation 18 consultation. However, those views will have to be justified by evidence and balanced with the Council's clear responsibility to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	I trust these developments are not a fait accompli and public opinion is not ignored. It will be a travesty to develop these beautiful fields. The infrastructure cannot cope now. Precious Green Belt will be used. It will blight the human population but also fauna and flora. Find somewhere else that is better suited and an environment that will cope.	None stated.	The Council will continue to take account of public opinion. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	I object to the huge developments proposed on Green Belt for the following reasons: Traffic congestion - through Ripley, Lion Park, etc. An additional 800 cars could bring constant gridlock. Our road will not cope with the increased wear and tear. Additional hard landscaping will worsen existing road	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				flooding after heavy rain.		also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council 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 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.	
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	I object to the huge developments proposed on Green Belt for the following reasons:  Traffic congestion - through Ripley, Lion Park, etc. An additional 800 cars could bring constant gridlock. Our road will not cope with the increased wear and tear. Additional hard landscaping will worsen existing road flooding after heavy rain.	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 the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. Flood risk issues are addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	Air quality is already very poor and there will be increased pollution, and further damage to the environment as a result to fauna and flora. Deer, butterfly and bee numbers locally already falling. Increasing pollution and removing more of their habitat will compound an already growing problem.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	Air quality is already very poor and there will be increased pollution, and further damage to the environment as a result to fauna and flora. Deer, butterfly and bee numbers locally already falling. Increasing pollution and removing more of their habitat will compound an already growing problem.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB13	The consultants' Green Belt Review did not recommend one of the fields as appropriate for use, so why is the Council going against these recommendations?	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Site GB12 is recommended for development in the Green Belt boundary review. Other evidence base such as the Sustainability Appraisal supports the allocation of site GB13. Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper set out how the Council has used the evidence in the Green Belt boundary review to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1107	Nicola	Collins	GB12	The consultants' Green Belt Review did not recommend one of the fields as appropriate for use, so why is the Council going against these recommendations?	None stated.	This issues has been comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	Site GB12 is recommended for release by the Green Belt boundary review report. The release of GB13 is justified by other evidence base of the Council. 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 development needs over the entire plan period. The allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared against all the other reasonable alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per 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 an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land in the urban area to meet 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. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of potential alternative sites. The sites proposed allocation, including GB12 and GB13 are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particular Coldharbour Road. The B367 is busy with through traffic to/from A3/M25 and lacks footways. Development at Wisley Airfield (Guildford Borough) will increase traffic. Pyrford and Wisley will be unable to cope with further population and traffic.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particular Coldharbour Road. The B367 is busy with through traffic to/from A3/M25 and lacks footways. Development at Wisley Airfield (Guildford Borough) will increase traffic. Pyrford and Wisley will be unable to cope with further population and 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
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	We currently benefit from participating in a vibrant village community with access to several outdoor pursuits (walking, orienteering, cycling, photography) which are inexpensive and improve fitness. These are only available through access to unspoilt rural countryside. Avoid development of GB12 and GB13 to maintain rural character and instead promote access to the local countryside to improve the future physical and mental wellbeing of local residents.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	We currently benefit from participating in a vibrant village community with access to several outdoor pursuits (walking, orienteering, cycling, photography) which are inexpensive and improve fitness. These are only available through access to unspoilt rural countryside. Avoid development of GB12 and GB13 to maintain rural character and instead promote access to the local countryside to improve the future physical and mental wellbeing of local residents.	None stated.	The Council has taken significant care to make sure that the proposals does not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. 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
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Local infrastructure is already stretched; nursery and pre-school, primary school, lack of state education, health facilities, and elderly residents need more local support.	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 housing proposals will include accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. 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
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Local infrastructure is already stretched; nursery and pre-school, primary school, lack of state education, health facilities, and elderly residents need more local support.	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	No further modification is 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.	
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Concern for historic environment impact of development. GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to the village and heritage assets, including Grade II listed buildings. Trees in GB12 are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The area is of archaeological importance.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1172	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Concern for historic environment impact of development. GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to the village and heritage assets, including Grade II listed buildings. Trees in GB12 are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The area is of archaeological importance.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	Site GB12 is recommended for release by the Green Belt boundary review report. The release of GB13 is justified by other evidence base of the Council. 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 development needs over the entire plan period. The allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared against all the other reasonable alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	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 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. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of potential alternative sites. The sites proposed allocation, including GB12 and GB13 are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable 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
					Review.		
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	<p>Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particular Coldharbour Road. The B367 is busy with through traffic to/from A3/M25 and lacks footways. Development at Wisley Airfield (Guildford Borough) will increase traffic. Pyrford and Wisley will be unable to cope with further population and traffic.</p> <p>We currently benefit from participating in a vibrant village community with access to several outdoor pursuits (walking, orienteering, cycling, photography) which are inexpensive and improve fitness. These are only available through access to unspoilt rural countryside. Avoid development of GB12 and GB13 to maintain rural character and instead promote access to the local countryside to improve the future physical and mental wellbeing of local residents.</p>	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council is working with Guildford Borough Council to make sure that the traffic impacts of the Wisley Airfield development is fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	<p>Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particular Coldharbour Road. The B367 is busy with through traffic to/from A3/M25 and lacks footways. Development at Wisley Airfield (Guildford Borough) will increase traffic. Pyrford and Wisley will be unable to cope with further population and traffic. We currently benefit from participating in a vibrant village community with access to several outdoor pursuits (walking, orienteering, cycling, photography) which are inexpensive and improve fitness. These are only available through access to unspoilt rural countryside. Avoid development of GB12 and GB13 to maintain rural character and instead promote access to the local countryside to improve the future physical and mental wellbeing of local residents.</p>	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	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
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Local infrastructure is already stretched; nursery and pre-school, primary school, lack of state education, health facilities, and elderly residents need more local support.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	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 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
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Local infrastructure is already stretched; nursery and pre-school, primary school, lack of state education, health facilities, and elderly residents need more local support.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability,	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.	No further modification is 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 per the Green Belt Review.		
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB12	Concern for historic environment impact of development. GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to the village and heritage assets, including Grade II listed buildings. Trees in GB12 are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The area is of archaeological importance.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1216	Annabel	Collyer-Todd	GB13	Concern for historic environment impact of development. GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to the village and heritage assets, including Grade II listed buildings. Trees in GB12 are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The area is of archaeological importance.	Preserve GB12 and GB13 within the Green Belt and consider other sites that have already been identified as being more suitable in terms of sustainability, as per the Green Belt Review.	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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	Highlights major developments outside the borough boundary including Wisley Airfield. Developments outside the borough will increase congestion and potentially traffic gridlock. Will Newark Bridges cope with additional traffic?	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, paragraph 1.5, 1.13, 6.2 and Section 24.0. The Council is required to engage with relevant neighbouring authorities regarding cross boundary issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	Highlights major developments outside the borough boundary including Wisley Airfield. Developments outside the borough will increase congestion and potentially traffic gridlock. Will Newark Bridges cope with additional traffic?	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, paragraph 1.5, 1.13, 6.2 and Section 24.0. The Council is required to engage with relevant neighbouring authorities regarding cross boundary issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	Pyrford is a pleasant environment with a village character. Accepts some change must occur, but the scale of development will change the character of the village. Questions if there are different solutions such as focussing supply of flats for downsizers or encouraging affordable housing.	None stated.	This representation regarding harm to the local character has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 18.0 and Section 7.0  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).  This representation regarding alternative solutions has been addressed in 9.0  The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.  However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.  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	No further modification is 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 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.	
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	Pyrford is a pleasant environment with a village character. Accepts some change must occur, but the scale of development will change the character of the village. Questions if there are different solutions such as focussing supply of flats for downsizers or encouraging affordable housing.	None stated.	This representation regarding harm to the local character has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 18.0 and Section 7.0. 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). This representation regarding alternative solutions has been addressed in 9.0. The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	The character of Pyrford is important. The natural landscape and views should be maintained. Footpaths should be retained. Pyrford's countryside is a borough asset.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that local character and landscape features are important characteristics of the Borough. In particular, 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> <p>In preparing the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council has considered the impact of the proposals on landscape character. This has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape 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 landscape 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>The key requirements for the site note there are opportunities to form pedestrian and cycle way through the site and that the development should improve connectivity to recreation space.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	The character of Pyrford is important. The natural landscape and views should be maintained. Footpaths should be retained. Pyrford's countryside is a borough asset.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that local character and landscape features are important characteristics of the Borough. In particular, 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> <p>In preparing the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council has considered the impact of the proposals on landscape character. This has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape 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 landscape 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>The key requirements for the site note there are opportunities to form pedestrian and cycle way through the site and that the development should improve connectivity to recreation space.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	SofS for Business, Innovation and Skills and President of the Board of Trade states "there is no need to make use of Greenbelt". Agree with the views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Object to development proposals in Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	SofS for Business, Innovation and Skills and President of the Board of Trade states "there is no need to make use of Greenbelt". Agree with the views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Object to development proposals in Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	Consider the ecological impact. Consider water and sewerage impact.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Pyrford School is at capacity and further development could make the situation worse. Elderly Care Facilities are needed. Nursery and Pre School facilities are at capacity at present.			
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	Consider the ecological impact. Consider water and sewerage impact. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development could make the situation worse. Elderly Care Facilities are needed. Nursery and Pre School facilities are at capacity at present.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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</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 issues of the area.	
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	Pyrford's historic buildings and CAs could be damaged by removing these sites.	None stated.	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).  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
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	Pyrford's historic buildings and CAs could be damaged by removing these sites.	None stated.	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).  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
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB12	The Council has gone against the GBR recommendations for Pyrford. The Council has not actioned GBR comments in paragraph 2 therefore is it correct to continue with the DPD?	None stated.	Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. The Council responded to all of the questions asked at the same meeting and these were minuted and available online. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can also 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 regards to the representation about the Green Belt Boundary Review please read 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
909	Ronald	Colvin	GB13	The Council has gone against the GBR recommendations for Pyrford. The Council has not actioned GBR comments in paragraph 2 therefore is it correct to continue with the DPD?	None stated.	Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. The Council responded to all of the questions asked at the same meeting and these were minuted and available online  Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can also 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 regards to the representation about the Green Belt Boundary Review please read 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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)	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
					explored.		
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. Harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify the development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. The part of the representation on the appropriateness and justification for the development in a Green Belt location is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters topic paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Objects to the proposals, which would exacerbate existing traffic issues in the Mayford area. This is a particular problem for parents, and people going into Woking. Suggests that this is a reason why schools in the past in this area have closed.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	Objects to the proposals, which would exacerbate existing traffic issues in the Mayford area. This is a particular problem for parents, and people going into Woking. Suggests that this is a reason why schools in the past in this area have closed.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	Objects to the proposals, which would exacerbate existing traffic issues in the Mayford area. This is a particular problem for parents, and people going into Woking. Suggests that this is a reason why schools in the past in this area have closed.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	Objects to the proposals, which would exacerbate existing traffic issues in the Mayford area. This is a particular problem for parents, and people going into Woking. Suggests that this is a reason why schools in the past in this area have closed.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	Objects to the proposals, which would exacerbate existing traffic issues in the Mayford area. This is a particular problem for parents, and people going into Woking. Suggests that this is a reason why schools in the past in this area have closed.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for	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	No further modification is 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 Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	the reasons stated.	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.	
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Why is it necessary to provide a commercial sports area at this site. Woking Leisure Centre has plenty of facilities available, which are quite often unused.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at this site is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	General	Over the last few years, many blocks of flats and new building have sprung up in the heavily populated part of Woking. Developers are making a killing, and asks if the Planning Department are in collusion with these developers.	None stated.	The Council has a duty to plan for the development requirements in the Borough, as set out in its Core Strategy. Woking Town Centre is considered a sustainable location for higher density development, which in part explains the development referred to. The representation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	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. 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	The sites cannot seriously be considered due to lack of infrastructure. There are surface drainage issues on Saunders Lane, which is sometimes subject to flooding and no bus routes. Hook Hill Lane is too narrow and also subject to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. On the lack of bus routes, the point made 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	The sites cannot seriously be considered due to lack of infrastructure. There are surface drainage issues on Saunders Lane, which is sometimes subject to flooding and no bus routes. Hook Hill Lane is too narrow and also subject to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. On the lack of bus routes, the point made 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	The sites cannot seriously be considered due to lack of infrastructure. There are surface drainage issues on Saunders Lane, which is sometimes subject to flooding and no bus routes. Hook Hill Lane is too narrow and also subject	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. On the lack of bus routes, the point made 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	No further modification is 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 flooding.		meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	The sites cannot seriously be considered due to lack of infrastructure. There are surface drainage issues on Saunders Lane, which is sometimes subject to flooding and no bus routes. Hook Hill Lane is too narrow and also subject to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. On the lack of bus routes, the point made 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	The sites cannot seriously be considered due to lack of infrastructure. There are surface drainage issues on Saunders Lane, which is sometimes subject to flooding and no bus routes. Hook Hill Lane is too narrow and also subject to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. On the lack of bus routes, the point made 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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Local infrastructure and services would be stretched beyond the limits, particularly health and welfare services and hospices.	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. Need for other infrastructure will be dealt with in a similar way. The Council is currently working with the fire service to provide a new fire station, prior to starting development of Victoria Square in Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	Local infrastructure and services would be stretched beyond the limits, particularly health and welfare services and hospices.	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. Need for other infrastructure will be dealt with in a similar way. The Council is currently working with the fire service to provide a new fire station, prior to starting development of Victoria Square in Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	Local infrastructure and services would be stretched beyond the limits, particularly health and welfare services and hospices.	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. Need for other infrastructure will be dealt with in a similar way. The Council is currently working with the fire service to provide a new fire station, prior to starting development of Victoria Square in Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	Local infrastructure and services would be stretched beyond the limits, particularly health and welfare services and hospices.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Need for other infrastructure will be dealt with in a similar way. The Council is currently working with the fire service to provide a new fire station, prior to starting development of Victoria Square in Woking Town Centre.	
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	Local infrastructure and services would be stretched beyond the limits, particularly health and welfare services and hospices.	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. Need for other infrastructure will be dealt with in a similar way. The Council is currently working with the fire service to provide a new fire station, prior to starting development of Victoria Square in Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	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>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Roads around Mayford have various pinch points, and are secondary road already used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding Egley Road. These road are under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council and unaware of surveys taking place by the. Surveys referred to by the Council's senior planning officer were undertaken in school holidays. Upkeep of road is already costing enormous amounts.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	Roads around Mayford have various pinch points, and are secondary road already used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding Egley Road. These road are under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council and unaware of surveys taking place by the. Surveys referred to by the Council's senior planning officer were undertaken in school holidays. Upkeep of road is already costing enormous amounts.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	Roads around Mayford have various pinch points, and are secondary road already used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding Egley Road. These road are under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council and unaware of surveys taking place by the. Surveys referred to by the Council's senior planning officer were undertaken in school holidays. Upkeep of road is already costing enormous amounts.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	Roads around Mayford have various pinch points, and are secondary road already used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding Egley Road. These road are under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council and unaware of surveys taking place by the. Surveys referred to by the Council's senior planning officer were undertaken in school holidays. Upkeep of road is already costing enormous amounts.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	Roads around Mayford have various pinch points, and are secondary road already used as a rat run for vehicles avoiding Egley Road. These road are under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council and unaware of surveys taking place by the. Surveys referred to by the Council's senior planning officer were undertaken in school holidays. Upkeep of road is already costing enormous amounts.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	There is no justification for further expansion in and around Mayford. The harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify development.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at this site is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	There is no justification for further expansion in and around Mayford. The harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify development.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	There is no justification for further expansion in and around Mayford. The harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify development.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	There is no justification for further expansion in and around Mayford. The harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify development.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	There is no justification for further expansion in and around Mayford. The harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness would not justify development.	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
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	While the Government wants to provide more housing, how can it be considered with rising house prices and values in the area to build on the Green Belt.	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. Information on the assessment of reasonable alternative sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB9	While the Government wants to provide more housing, how can it be considered with rising house prices and values in the area to build on the Green Belt.	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. Information on the assessment of reasonable alternative sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB10	While the Government wants to provide more housing, how can it be considered with rising house prices and values in the area to build on the Green Belt.	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. Information on the assessment of reasonable alternative sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB11	While the Government wants to provide more housing, how can it be considered with rising house prices and values in the area to build on the Green Belt.	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. Information on the assessment of reasonable alternative sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB14	While the Government wants to provide more housing, how can it be considered with rising house prices and values in the area to build on the Green Belt.	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. Information on the assessment of reasonable alternative sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1507	R.A.	Conway	GB8	Asks why works has started on the Egley Road proposed school site?	None stated.	It is uncertain why this was the case at time the response being submitted, and it is assumed any activity taking place was permitted development. However it should be noted that planning permission has now been granted for development of the site for a secondary school and leisure facilities (ref PLAN/2015/0703) and the permitted works will be in progress.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
629	Melanie	Cook	GB12	Objects to the proposal. It would greatly reduce Pyrford's unique charm and character.	None stated.	The character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented by the Council, as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						There is 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.	
629	Melanie	Cook	GB13	Objects to the proposal. It would greatly reduce Pyrford's unique charm and character.	None stated.	<p>The character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented by the Council, as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study.</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
629	Melanie	Cook	GB12	The infrastructure could not support so many new houses. Travel times to West Byfleet are already long at rush hour, and are likely to become worse. Water pressure is poor, and would be worsened, and the local primary school is already full to capacity. Disagrees with the proposal's claim that the doctor's surgery in West Byfleet is a 22 minutes walk away. It is difficult to get an appointment at the health centre as they can't deal with the current number of patients.	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
629	Melanie	Cook	GB13	The infrastructure could not support so many new houses. Travel times to West Byfleet are already long at rush hour, and are likely to become worse. Water pressure is poor, and would be worsened, and the local primary school is already full to capacity. Disagrees with the proposal's claim that the doctors surgery in West Byfleet is a 22 minute walk away. It is difficult to get an appointment at the health centre as they can't deal with the current number of patients.	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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB12	Concerned that infrastructure will not be able to support the new proposals. Local and surrounding road are often congested. Utilities suffer problems e.g. low water pressure. Problems will be exacerbated with the proposed growth	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage. 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 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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB13	Concerned that infrastructure will not be able to support the new proposals. Local and surrounding road are often congested. Utilities suffer problems e.g. low water pressure. Problems will be exacerbated with the proposed growth	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.</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 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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB12	People chose to live in Pyrford for its unique charm and character of open spaces. This will be lost through the proposed development	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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).	
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB13	People chose to live in Pyrford for its unique charm and character of open spaces. This will be lost through the proposed development	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0  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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB12	Local schools are at capacity with specific procedures put in place to stop sibling spaces. Disagree with the assessment which suggest the sites are 22 minutes walk from the doctors.	None stated.	This representation regarding school provision 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. 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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB13	Local schools are at capacity with specific procedures put in place to stop sibling spaces.  Disagree with the assessment which suggest the sites are 22 minutes walk from the doctors.	None stated.	This representation regarding school provision 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.  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
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB12	Appreciate the need to build more houses to meet the needs of the growing population, however considers the proposals for Pyrford to be inappropriate and disproportionate. Development should be at a smaller scale and provide affordable houses for the elderly, so that elderly people have the option to downsize and remain in the area. This would also free up family accommodation in Pyrford.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied. 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. 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. From the description provided, the representor may be referring to the northern Section of GB12. The potential quantum of housing that could be accommodated on the northern Section of the site will not deliver the quantum of housing required to meet the future housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1352	Laurence	Cook	GB13	Appreciate the need to build more houses to meet the needs of the growing population, however considers the proposals for Pyrford to be inappropriate and disproportionate. Development should be at a smaller scale and provide affordable houses for the elderly, so that elderly people have	Consider development on the smaller field by Arbour (next to Tags	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the option to downsize and remain in the area. This would also free up family accommodation in Pyrford.	Lane)	<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> <p>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.</p> <p>From the description provided, the representor may be referring to the northern Section of GB12. The potential quantum of housing that could be accommodated on the northern Section of the site will not deliver the quantum of housing required to meet the future housing need.</p>	
1377	Laura	Cook	GB12	Objects to the proposals. Concerned about the impact on local amenities and infrastructure (school, doctors and car parking) which are already under pressure.	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 Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshot 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
1377	Laura	Cook	GB13	Objects to the proposals. Concerned about the impact on local amenities and infrastructure (school, doctors and car parking) which are already under pressure.	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 Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshot 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</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
						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.	
1377	Laura	Cook	GB12	Concerned about the impact the proposals will have on the Green Belt, natural charm and beauty of the area, including footpaths.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1377	Laura	Cook	GB13	Concerned about the impact the proposals will have on the Green Belt, natural charm and beauty of the area, including footpaths.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1680	Clive, Ann Ford	Cook	General	Object. Significant flooding takes place and the surface water drainage in the area is inadequate. An dwelling on the site would increase flood risk to others.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	General	If GB8 is used for a school and leisure centre, there should be no more building south of Woking due to limitation caused by traffic density on the A320.	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 mitigation measures referred to in this paper means that development, as set out in the draft allocations, could be supported in terms of transport infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB8	If GB8 is used for a school and leisure centre, there should be no more building south of Woking due to limitation caused by traffic density on the A320.	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 mitigation measures referred to in this paper means that development, as set out in the draft allocations, could be supported in terms of transport infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	General	Are the technical studies, transport review and outline plans in the public domain, or if not, could they be shared with those interested?	None stated.	These documents are available on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/policy/ldfresearch">http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/policy/ldfresearch</a> . An outline of each site is available within the Draft Site Allocations Document ( <a href="http://www.woking2027.info/allocations">http://www.woking2027.info/allocations</a> ) however, outline plans would be submitted at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	General	While the Core Strategy requires the Council to find sites for an additional 550 homes up to 2027, there is no requirement for the council to allocate sites to the period up to 2040. Rather than estimate how many homes may be required in this period, the Council should argue that extra homes should be accommodated outside the Green Belt. This would be consistent with recent government statements on the importance of the Green Belt.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	Is the land in single ownership or is it part owned by the Council?	None stated.	The site is part owned by the Council (about 6 hectares) and a modification is proposed to reflect this error in the Delivery arrangements Section and be clear about its multiple ownership. The 7 ha referred to in the second bullet point of the policy is the net developable area. The remainder of the site would not be developed due to various constraints, such as flood risk and protection of landscape/ escarpment features. The site also includes Mayford Village Hall and adjacent recreational uses (the latter mainly Council owned) which would again not be developed, but retained as valuable community assets. They are included within the site boundary to ensure a strong defensible Green Belt boundary.	On page 314 modify the Delivery arrangements section to state as the first bullet point 'The land is in multiple ownership' rather than single ownership.
470	Michael	Cooke	GB10	Is the land in single ownership or is it part owned by the Council?	None stated.	This site is in single ownership, as stated in the Delivery arrangements Section.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	As only about 40% of GB11 is planned to be developed, questions if the site would be better subdivided into two or more parcels.	None stated.	This is due to environmental and landscape constraints on the site, and will be addressed through sensitive design and layout (as per the allocation's key requirements and relevant Core Strategy policies), to be outlined in any future detailed planning application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB8	There is a neglect and no notice taken of Core Strategy policy CS24 which aims to protect landscape and townscape character, and requires new development to provide positive benefit to.	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
470	Michael	Cooke	GB10	There is a neglect and no notice taken of Core Strategy policy CS24 which aims to protect landscape and townscape character, and requires new development to provide positive benefit to.	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
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	There is a neglect and no notice taken of Core Strategy policy CS24 which aims to protect landscape and townscape character, and requires new development to provide positive benefit to.	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
470	Michael	Cooke	GB10	An important purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain separation between towns and villages. The proposal built on open land separating Hook Heath and	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mayford, and thus incorporates Mayford into Woking. It is thus fundamentally flawed and virtually any other option of extending Woking's current boundary into the countryside would be preferable.			
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	An important purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain separation between towns and villages. The proposal built on open land separating Hook Heath and Mayford, and thus incorporates Mayford into Woking. It is thus fundamentally flawed and virtually any other option of extending Woking's current boundary into the countryside would be preferable.	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
470	Michael	Cooke	GB14	The removal of GB14 from the Green Belt to create Green Infrastructure is unnecessary as no change of use is planned. It is not an exceptional circumstance required for land to be removed. The proposal takes no note of the Neighbourhood Plan policies which are expected to be part of the planning framework by the time the DPD is agreed.	None stated.	This is acknowledged. While exceptional circumstances apply to other sites in Mayford and Hook Heath for their release from Green Belt for development (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12) this site is proposed from release to ensure clear and logical Green Belt boundary is drawn (as per NPPF paragraph 85), with regard to its position between sites GB8 and GB10, rather than a need for its release to accommodate development. As outlined in the allocation (and representation) the site would be protected for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	General	Proposals for developing the Green Belt in 2027-40 period should be withdrawn. Joining Mayford with Woking should be prevented.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB10	Proposals for developing the Green Belt in 2027-40 period should be withdrawn. Joining Mayford with Woking should be prevented.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The separation of Mayford and Woking is covered in Section 12.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	Proposals for developing the Green Belt in 2027-40 period should be withdrawn. Joining Mayford with Woking should be prevented.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The separation of Mayford and Woking is covered in Section 12.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	General	The sites put forward seem highly influenced by the Green Belt Review. This is a flawed document which has not been consulted on and is incapable of supporting the proposals.	None stated.	The Green Belt Review is not flawed, and is considered to be robust and credible. This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. It should be noted there is no requirement to consult on evidence based documents. The Green Belt Review does not present the final list of draft allocations, or sites to be removed from the Green Belt (please see Section 17.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper for reasoning on this). It is therefore non-sensical to consult on sites, which for other valid reasons, the Council does not intend to take forward, and more logical to consult on a comprehensive collection of those it does i.e. the draft Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB8	If a school and large leisure centre were built, there would be a significant increase in traffic on what is, at rush hour, a highly congested road. This would exacerbate congestion, which will also be added to by building in the north of Guildford.	None stated.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand generated by that development. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB10	Sees that the reason for the inclusion of the site relies on evidence base including technical studies and a transport review.	None stated.	Comment noted. The evidence base supporting the Draft Site Allocations DPD is detailed in Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
470	Michael	Cooke	GB11	Sees that the reason for the inclusion of the site relies on evidence base including technical studies and a transport review.	None stated.	Comment noted. The evidence base supporting the Draft Site Allocations DPD is detailed in Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Filling in the space between Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane will be terrible. The area is well used by local people and this as well as the wonderful views, will be lost.	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).</p> <p>The representation regarding views has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape 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 landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular</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
						protecting important views.	
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Filling in the space between Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane will be terrible. The area is well used by local people and this as well as the wonderful views, will be lost.	None stated.	The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure. It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG). The representation regarding views has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape 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 landscape 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Filling in the space between Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane will be terrible. The area is well used by local people and this as well as the wonderful views, will be lost.	None stated.	The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.  It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).  The representation regarding views has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  In landscape 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 landscape 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Filling in the space between Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane will be terrible. The area is well used by local people and this as well as the wonderful views, will be lost.	None stated.	The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.  It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).  The representation regarding views has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  In landscape 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 landscape 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Concerned with light and noise pollution, particularly in the evenings and winter months	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Concerned with light and noise pollution, particularly in the evenings and winter months	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Concerned with light and noise pollution, particularly in the evenings and winter months	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						light and noise pollution.	
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Concerned with light and noise pollution, particularly in the evenings and winter months	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB7	Objects to proposals to build over much of the green fields in the village. Mayford already provides a number of Traveller facilities in the borough and an increase would have a negative impact on the openness of the area. The urban area should be considered first for Traveller sites and this has not been done, therefore the correct process has not been followed.	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 representation regarding the concentration of Traveller sites in the Borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. The representation regarding the possible negative impact on local character and landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.3, 4.9 and 4.10.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has followed the correct process in identifying Traveller sites to meet existing and future need. The process has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Objects to housing development on the sites but supports the need for another school in south Woking and the athletic facilities must be a good thing for young people.	None stated.	Support for the proposed school and sports facilities noted. The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. 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. Justification for releasing Green belt land for development to meet future development requirements of the Core Strategy 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Objects to housing development on the sites but supports the need for another school in south Woking and the athletic facilities must be a good thing for young people.	None stated.	Support for the proposed school and sports facilities noted. The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. 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. Justification for releasing Green belt land for development to meet future development requirements of the Core Strategy 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Objects to housing development on the sites but supports the need for another school in south Woking and the athletic facilities must be a good thing for young people.	None stated.	Support for the proposed school and sports facilities noted. The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. 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. Justification for releasing Green belt land for development to meet future development requirements of the Core Strategy 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Objects to housing development on the sites but supports the need for another school in south Woking and the athletic facilities must be a good thing for young people.	None stated.	Support for the proposed school and sports facilities noted. The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. 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. Justification for releasing Green belt land for development to meet future development requirements of the Core Strategy 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Mayford is a lovely village with history and character. There has to be alternative sites that are more suitable within the borough. 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 9.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Mayford is a lovely village with history and character. There has to be alternative sites that are more suitable within the borough. 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 9.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Mayford is a lovely village with history and character. There has to be alternative sites that are more suitable within the borough. 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 9.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Mayford is a lovely village with history and character. There has to be alternative sites that are more suitable within the borough. 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 9.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Mayford simply must remain a separate village and not be joined up to Woking or Guildford by careless and inappropriate development.	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Mayford simply must remain a separate village and not be joined up to Woking or Guildford by careless and inappropriate development.	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Mayford simply must remain a separate village and not be joined up to Woking or Guildford by careless and inappropriate development.	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Mayford simply must remain a separate village and not be joined up to Woking or Guildford by careless and inappropriate development.	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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB7	There are a lack of nearby school and other facilities.	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB7	The site is close to a number of residential properties and not suitable for associated business activities that need to be supported.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
684	Richard	Cooke	GB8	Saunders Lane and other local road are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes, it will also lead to accidents. People are likely to uses these narrow road as cut-throughs. The road to Worplesdon Station has 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 the lack of 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB9	Saunders Lane and other local road are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes, it will also lead to accidents. People are likely to uses these narrow road as cut-throughs. The road to Worplesdon Station has 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 the lack of 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB10	Saunders Lane and other local road are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes, it will also lead to accidents. People are likely to uses these narrow road as cut-throughs. The road to Worplesdon Station has 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 the lack of 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
684	Richard	Cooke	GB11	Saunders Lane and other local road are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes, it will also lead to accidents. People are likely to uses these narrow road as cut-throughs. The road to Worplesdon Station has 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 the lack of 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
606	Ian	Cooper	GB10	Objects to the proposals. They will mean the loss of a definite build edge to Woking and join up several smaller distinctly populated areas with their own history. This will rob these areas of Green Belt and add to unsightly urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
606	Ian	Cooper	GB11	Objects to the proposals. They will mean the loss of a definite build edge to Woking and join up several smaller distinctly populated areas with their own history. This will rob these areas of Green Belt and add to unsightly urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
606	Ian	Cooper	GB14	Objects to the proposals. They will mean the loss of a definite build edge to Woking and join up several smaller distinctly populated areas with their own history. This will rob these areas of Green Belt and add to unsightly urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
606	Ian	Cooper	GB10	There is currently a lack of supporting infrastructure, such as medical facilities and shops, meaning residents of new development will require vehicular transport, this increasing congestion and pollution on the existing road network.	None stated.	The general approach to ensuring adequate infrastructure, including road and transport, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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. 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 relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
606	Ian	Cooper	GB11	There is currently a lack of supporting infrastructure, such as medical facilities and shops, meaning residents of new development will require vehicular transport, this increasing congestion and pollution on the existing road network.	None stated.	The general approach to ensuring adequate infrastructure, including road and transport, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 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 relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
606	Ian	Cooper	GB10	The density of proposals is disproportionate compared with adjoining the Hook Heath 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
606	Ian	Cooper	GB11	The density of proposals is disproportionate compared with adjoining the Hook Heath 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
606	Ian	Cooper	GB10	The case for 'exceptional circumstances' for Green Belt release, required by planning law, has not been made, debated or agreed.	None stated.	The case for exceptional circumstances 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
606	Ian	Cooper	GB11	The case for 'exceptional circumstances' for Green Belt release, required by planning law, has not been made, debated or agreed.	None stated.	The case for exceptional circumstances 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
606	Ian	Cooper	GB14	The case for 'exceptional circumstances' for Green Belt release, required by planning law, has not been made, debated or agreed.	None stated.	The case for exceptional circumstances 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
9	Rob	Corlett	General	Concerned about proposals for new development, particularly the planned academy on the Woking – Guildford Road and the housing estate under construction adjacent to Moor Lane. Mayford has had enough encroachments on its Green Belt and with no extra provision for amenities. The southern area of Mayford is overly impacted upon by the Green Belt relaxation; a balanced approach sharing the impact would be more appropriate.	Looking at the overall Woking vicinity map it seems the southern area of Mayford is overly impacted upon by the Green Belt relaxation and surely a balanced approach sharing the impact would be more appropriate	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 concerns about the development at Moor Lane and Guildford Road are noted. The Site Allocations DPD is about development to meet future development needs. Whilst the Council has acknowledged the request to ensure a balanced approach to share the impacts of development across the Borough, it is important that development is located at most sustainable locations. The Council will seek to ensure that development is supported by adequate infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
9	Rob	Corlett	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. Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife.	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 Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is 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 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	
9	Rob	Corlett	GB8	Strongly object to the proposal for housing on this site, which 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. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB9	Strongly object to the proposal for housing on this site, which 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. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB10	Strongly object to the proposal for housing on this site, which 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. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement 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 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB11	Strongly object to the proposal for housing on this site, which 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. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement 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 landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the road or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
9	Rob	Corlett	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the road or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.	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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the road or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.	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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the road or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.	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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out, also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey 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	No further modification is 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. 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.	
9	Rob	Corlett	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out, also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out, also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey 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
9	Rob	Corlett	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out, also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey 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
9	Rob	Corlett	General	Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village, unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. I am happy that the Mayford Village Society also represents my views.	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 12. The Core Strategy includes specific policies to protect the character of Mayford (Policy CS6). It is accepted that the proposals will introduces change in the general vicinity of Mayford. However, it expected that they will not unacceptably undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB12	Objects to the proposals and is fundamentally opposed to the loss of any Green Belt, which is there to protect our countryside and needs to remain intact.	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. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB13	Objects to the proposals and is fundamentally opposed to the loss of any Green Belt, which is there to protect our countryside and needs to remain intact.	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. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB12	Frequently walks along the edge of one of the fields and enjoys its beauty, peace and wildlife. The proposed vast scale and massive number of houses will destroy the current village feel, the nature of a village and its tranquillity. Opposes the loss of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4) 21.0 and 23.0. 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.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB13	Frequently walks along the edge of one of the fields and enjoys its beauty, peace and wildlife. The proposed vast scale and massive number of houses will destroy the current village feel, the nature of a village and its tranquillity. Opposes the loss of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4) 21.0 and 23.0. 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 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB12	As well as the loss of huge green areas, the impact on already congested road is untenable. Also questions where the children will go to school. Expanding the village school to a 'mega primary' with intakes of 4 or more classes will destroy its current character and potentially its quality.	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, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1413	Barbara	Cormie	GB13	As well as the loss of huge green areas, the impact on already congested road is untenable. Also questions where the children will go to school. Expanding the village school to a 'mega primary' with intakes of 4 or more classes will destroy its current character and potentially its quality.	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, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB9	The proposed housing density of 33 dph for GB10 and GB11 are too high in area with narrow lanes, without footpaths and	We ask the council to	The Council believes that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate. However, they are indicative densities and actual densities will be agreed on a case by case basis during the planning application process taken into account the merits of the proposal. The traffic	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 light governed bridges, used as rat runs. Egley Road is already congested at peak times and could not cope with extra traffic.	reconsider these plans.	implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB10	The proposed housing density of 33 dph for GB10 and GB11 are too high in area with narrow lanes, without footpaths and traffic light governed bridges, used as rat runs. Egley Road is already congested at peak times and could not cope with extra traffic.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	The proposed densities are indicative. Each proposal will be examined on its own merits. However, the Council believes that, broadly, the densities could be achieved without undermining the general character of the area. 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. The Council is satisfied that the identity of Mayford will be retained as a result of the proposals. this matter is addressed in Section 12 and 23 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB11	The proposed housing density of 33 dph for GB10 and GB11 are too high in area with narrow lanes, without footpaths and traffic light governed bridges, used as rat runs. Egley Road is already congested at peak times and could not cope with extra traffic.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 18.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB8	The proposed housing density of 33 dph for GB10 and GB11 are too high in area with narrow lanes, without footpaths and traffic light governed bridges, used as rat runs. Egley Road is already congested at peak times and could not cope with extra traffic.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are reasonable, it has always been clear that they are indicative and actual densities will be agreed on a case by case basis on the merits of any proposals that come forward for the development of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB10	The proposed housing densities are considerably higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. Access would have to be from Hook Hill Lane or Saunders Lane, neither are suitable.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	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. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB11	The proposed housing densities are considerably higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. Access would have to be from Hook Hill Lane or Saunders Lane, neither are suitable.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	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. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB8	The proposed housing densities are considerably higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. Access would have to be from Hook Hill Lane or Saunders Lane, neither are suitable.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	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. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB9	The proposed housing densities are considerably higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. Access would have to be from Hook Hill Lane or Saunders Lane, neither are suitable.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	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. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB11	There are no details of the infrastructure needed to support the homes. We do not need any more out of town shops. Plans will have a huge impact on the area.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet</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 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	
168	V	Cornell	GB8	There are no details of the infrastructure needed to support the homes. We do not need any more out of town shops. Plans will have a huge impact on the area.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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
168	V	Cornell	GB9	There are no details of the infrastructure needed to support the homes. We do not need any more out of town shops. Plans will have a huge impact on the area.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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
168	V	Cornell	GB10	There are no details of the infrastructure needed to support the homes. We do not need any more out of town shops. Plans will have a huge impact on the area.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	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
168	V	Cornell	GB8	The Council needs to find Green Belt for 550 homes 2022-2027 not the 1200 proposed to 2040.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	The justification for safeguarding land to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040 is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB11	The Council needs to find Green Belt for 550 homes 2022-2027 not the 1200 proposed to 2040.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs between 2027 and 2040 is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB9	The Council needs to find Green Belt for 550 homes 2022-2027 not the 1200 proposed to 2040.	We ask the council to reconsider these plans.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040 is addressed comprehensively in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB10	The Council needs to find Green Belt for 550 homes 2022-2027 not the 1200 proposed to 2040.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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 safeguarded land is needed to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
168	V	Cornell	GB11	Register our strong objection to release of Green Belt land in the Hook Heath/Mayford area (Parcel 20) for intensive housing development. We understood Green Belt was to	We ask the council to reconsider	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				create green space between towns and villages and prevent sprawl. The green spaces surrounding the Town Centre make Woking and its village's attractive places to live. Those south of the town form a barrier between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This should only be released in exceptional circumstances.	these plans.	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.	
168	V	Cornell	GB8	Register our strong objection to release of Green Belt land in the Hook Heath/Mayford area (Parcel 20) for intensive housing development. We understood Green Belt was to create green space between towns and villages and prevent sprawl. The green spaces surrounding the Town Centre make Woking and its villages attractive places to live. Those south of the town form a barrier between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This should only be released in exceptional circumstances.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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
168	V	Cornell	GB9	Register our strong objection to release of Green Belt land in the Hook Heath/Mayford area (Parcel 20) for intensive housing development. We understood Green Belt was to create green space between towns and villages and prevent sprawl. The green spaces surrounding the Town Centre make Woking and its villages attractive places to live. Those south of the town form a barrier between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This should only be released in exceptional circumstances.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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
168	V	Cornell	GB10	Register our strong objection to release of Green Belt land in the Hook Heath/Mayford area (Parcel 20) for intensive housing development. We understood Green Belt was to create green space between towns and villages and prevent sprawl. The green spaces surrounding the Town Centre make Woking and its villages attractive places to live. Those south of the town form a barrier between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This should only be released in exceptional circumstances.	We ask the council to reconsider these 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 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. The Council is satisfied that the identity of Mayford will be retained as a result of the proposals. This matter is addressed in Section 12 and 23 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB20	Additional traffic and transport infrastructure need to be taken into account.	None stated.	The impact of the proposed allocation on the highways network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Council is fully committed to working with the County Highways Authority to make sure that development of all of the sites in the DPD, including the SANGs, do not have a significant impact on the highways network or cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB21	Additional traffic and transport infrastructure need to be taken into account.	None stated.	The impact of the proposed allocation on the highways network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Council is fully committed to working with the County Highways Authority to make sure that development of all of the sites in the DPD, including the SANGs, do not have a significant impact on the highways network or cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB19	All of Westfield Common is registered Common Land and meant to have a single management plan. Designating part of the site for a SANG is odd and will be subject to different policies and proposals. If the site was designated as a SANG, it will attract visitors who are just as likely to use all of the common. The information regarding the size of the site and boundary are incorrect. The information in the DPD is misleading.	The following information in the DPD document is incorrect and should be modified: Page 352 &	It is correct that the Council is seeking to allocate one Section of Westfield Common for a SANG. This is based on the advise and SANG guidelines drawn up by Natural England. As noted within the SANG design guidelines, one of the criteria is that a SANG should be a walking loop. Although this may be possible by including the entire Westfield Common into the proposal, the route would require several road crossings which may have highway safety implications. As previously noted, the Council is fully committed to working with Natural England and other relevant stakeholders in ensuring that any proposed SANG is in accordance with the guidelines and requirements of Natural England.	Amend the site boundary to reflect the existing common land boundary to the south of Moor Lane and removal of the western part of the site.

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					<p>353 - The eastern boundary shown on proposal GB19 (the line running from Robin Hood Lane to Moor Lane) is wrong and includes gardens and land belonging to private properties (Moor House and properties south of Moor Lane). The correct boundary of this site should be the actual boundary of Westfield Common (land held by Woking Borough Council) in this area.</p> <p>Page 354 - If the boundary is restricted to the actual boundary on Westfield Common, the resulting size of the proposal site would only be 12 hectares NOT 17.4 hectares as stated. The site would therefore only have a potential SPA mitigation for around 620 dwellings on the basis of the calculations in this document.</p> <p>Page 355 – The proposal</p>	<p>The Council accept that the boundary of the proposed site should be amended. The Council is therefore proposing to amend the site boundary to reflect the existing common land designation within this Section of Westfield Common. The allocation and key requirements will be updated to reflect the amendment. The Council believe that the amendment will ensure that the proposed SANG will be suitable and meet the SANG requirements as set out by Natural England.</p>	<p>Amend site size to reflect site boundary alteration to read as follows: 11ha</p> <p>Amend key requirement regarding SNCI to read as follows:</p> <p>The entire site is a SNCI</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					incorrectly states that only part of this land is SNCI. This is incorrect. All of Westfield Common owned by Woking Borough Council is SNCI. Further consideration of the suitability of this site as SANG should be made by Woking Council given that it does not meet a number of the mandatory criteria.		
1536	Bill	Corney	GB21	Any car parks should be located on SANG land not common land.	None stated.	This is noted by the Council. The Council has and is committed to working with the relevant stakeholders including Natural England, to make sure that there is no adverse impacts on environmental constraints such as common land. This will be considered in further detail during the design and Development Management stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB20	Site is prone to flooding which would reduce the number of visitors to the site. This would not benefit the SPA.	None stated.	The Council notes the representation regarding flood risk. As part of the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council has worked with Natural England in identifying suitable sites for SANGs in order to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The Council is committed to working with Natural England and other relevant stakeholders in bringing forward this site for SANG use. In doing so, the Council is aware that it will have to address a number of environmental and infrastructure considerations including flood risk. The Council believe that by following Guidelines for the creation of Suitable Accessible Natural Green Space (SANGS) and working with other stakeholders, the flood risk issue can be addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB21	Site is prone to flooding which would reduce the number of visitors to the site. This would not benefit the SPA.	None stated.	The Council notes the representation regarding flood risk. As part of the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council has worked with Natural England in identifying suitable sites for SANGs in order to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The Council is committed to working with Natural England and other relevant stakeholders in bringing forward this site for SANG use. In doing so, the Council is aware that it will have to address a number of environmental and infrastructure considerations including flood risk. The Council believe that by following Guidelines for the creation of Suitable Accessible Natural Green Space (SANGS) and working with other stakeholders, the flood risk issue can be addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB21	Support the supply of new land to the south of the common as a new SANG to be incorporated with the first SANG site to the east as it would increase public access to open space.	None stated.	Support for the proposed site is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB19	Difficult to establish a SANG without having a negative impact on the quality of the Common Land. A car park and facilities will have to be developed, circular paths put into place and be suitable for leash dog walking. No information provided on car parking facilities and would require DEFRA consent as it is Common Land. No replacement has been offered. The management plan for the site states that a circular path would be unsuitable. The land is wet woodland and not an open heath suitable for off leash dog walking. There are also wildlife and physical issues that make dog walking difficult. The site is already used for leisure	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the infrastructure requirements for a new SANG. The Council has and is committed to working with Natural England and other relevant stakeholders in bringing forward this site for SANG use. The provision and siting of facilities as well as the detailed design of the proposed SANG will be considered prior and during the Development Management stage of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				purposes. Developments in the area are already likely to see some negative impact on the condition of the Common Land.		<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. 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.</p> <p>It should be noted that designation of a SANG would not require the deregistration of the Common Land on the site. Horsell Common SANG in the north of the Borough for example is both Common Land and SANG.</p>	
1536	Bill	Corney	GB21	Object to including the existing Common Land into a SANG site.	None stated.	Objection to including the existing Common Land in the SANG is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB20	Support the designation of this land as SANG as it would increase public access to open space	None stated.	Support for the proposed site is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB19	Justification for the allocation is weak as the site is registered Common Land with an extensive network of paths. The public already have access to it. Objecting. The site is already connected to other parts of the borough which SCC maintain. SANGS are mitigation for SPA sites and their effectiveness will depend on their location and design. SANGs should be more attractive to users than SPAs.	None stated.	The objection is noted. The Council is committed to providing SANGs within the Borough to ensure that development does not have an adverse impact in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. As with several of the SANGs already established within the Borough, including White Rose Lane and Horsell Common, the proposed SANG already contains land designations including common land. As part of the SPA mitigation process, improving access, facilities and awareness are crucial in offering residents with a suitable alternative to the TBH SPAs. The proposed allocation of this site, in combination with the proposed allocations of nearby SANGs could create a significant SANG network that would have significant positive impact on the SPAs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1536	Bill	Corney	GB19	Why is the site referred to as a Mayford SANG when it is part of Westfield Common and Sutton Green. It is physically unconnected to Mayford Village. Westfield and Westfield Common is our identity and want to maintain this.	Rename the site if allocated for a SANG to reflect location and local identity.	The representation and proposed modification are noted. The Council accepts that the proposed SANG is predominantly located on Westfield Common. Nevertheless the site falls within the existing ward of Mayford and Sutton Green. The Council propose to amend the name of the site to reflect the representation	Rename site GB19 to read as follows: 'Westfield Common SANG'
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	<p>The development of the sites are likely to involve the removal of significant trees in order to get sufficient access to the sites. Object to this.</p> <p>Development proposals will exacerbate existing traffic problems already experienced on the site and could gridlock the whole area.</p> <p>Pedestrian movement is a concern, the busy road and traffic will impact on road safety.</p> <p>The congestion will have a negative effect on the character of the area- e.g. the local heritage site.</p>	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</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 representation regarding local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	<p>The development of the sites are likely to involve the removal of significant trees in order to get sufficient access to the sites. Object to this.</p> <p>Development proposals will exacerbate existing traffic problems already experienced on the site and could gridlock the whole area.</p> <p>Pedestrian movement is a concern, the busy road and traffic will impact on road safety.</p> <p>The congestion will have a negative effect on the character of the area- e.g. the local heritage site.</p>	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</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>	No further modification is 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 representation regarding local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0	
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	Proposals will reduce the natural drainage of the site and leave Pyrford vulnerable to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	Proposals will reduce the natural drainage of the site and leave Pyrford vulnerable to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	GB land should be preserved. Is not aware of exceptional circumstances that justifies the release of the sites from GB.	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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	GB land should be preserved. Is not aware of exceptional circumstances that justifies the release of the sites from GB.	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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	Local resident. Concerned that the proposals will have a negative impact on the character of the village, including its footpaths, conservation area, heritage assets. The landscape in the south of the area is currently well preserved and will be destroyed if proposals go ahead.	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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	Local resident. Concerned that the proposals will have a negative impact on the character of the village, including its footpaths, conservation area, heritage assets. The landscape in the south of the area is currently well preserved and will be destroyed if proposals go ahead.	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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	GB12 and GB13 are consistently assessed as not being suitable for release from the GB due to poor sustainability and a high level of landscape sensitivity.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	GB12 and GB13 are consistently assessed as not being suitable for release from the GB due to poor sustainability and a high level of landscape sensitivity.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	Local infrastructure is inadequate to support the proposed level of growth. Existing facilities are at capacity, including schools, health centre.	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. Please also see Section 20.0 and 24.0.  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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	Local infrastructure is inadequate to support the proposed level of growth. Existing facilities are at capacity, including schools, health centre.	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. Please also see Section 20.0 and 24.0.  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
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB12	The woodland and hedgerows in and around the sites are important for wildlife. The trees in the area provide a effective screen between the urban and rural landscape, where some of the trees are protected by TPOs	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 landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1297	Coral	Cornwell	GB13	The woodland and hedgerows in and around the sites are important for wildlife. The trees in the area provide a effective screen between the urban and rural landscape, where some of the trees are protected by TPOs	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	No further modification is 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/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 landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.	
732	Ian	Costar	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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
732	Ian	Costar	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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
732	Ian	Costar	GB12	The medical facilities are at capacity and 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
732	Ian	Costar	GB13	The medical facilities are at capacity and 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
732	Ian	Costar	GB12	Parking for the school and shops is inadequate and further development will make the situation worse.	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.  In addition, the proposed allocation is within walking and cycling distance of the local community facilities. This will therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
732	Ian	Costar	GB13	Parking for the school and shops is inadequate and further development will make the situation worse.	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. In addition, the proposed allocation is within walking and cycling distance of the local community facilities. This will therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
732	Ian	Costar	GB12	Surely there are adequate brownfield sites in the borough to development rather than the Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation regarding brownfield sites and the principle of Green Belt development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
732	Ian	Costar	GB13	Surely there are adequate brownfield sites in the borough to development rather than the Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation regarding brownfield sites and the principle of Green Belt development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. 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 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
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. 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 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB12	The medical facilities are at capacity and 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
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB13	The medical facilities are at capacity and 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
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB12	Parking for the school and shops is inadequate and further development will make the situation worse.	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.  In addition, the proposed allocation is within walking and cycling distance of the local community facilities. This will therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB13	Parking for the school and shops is inadequate and further development will make the situation worse.	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. In addition, the proposed allocation is within walking and cycling distance of the local community facilities. This will therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB12	Surely there are adequate brownfield sites in the borough to development rather than the Green Belt.	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 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
733	Vivienne	Costar	GB13	Surely there are adequate brownfield sites in the borough to development rather than the Green Belt.	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 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
749	David	Cottle	GB5	Proposals will diminish the quality of life for local people and have a negative impact on local house values. WBC will need to pay local residents for the destruction of a natural local amenity, similar to when the M25 was built.	None stated.	The representation regarding quality of life has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The proposed allocations are not expected to have a significant negative impact. Through the specific wording of the key requirements for the site along with the policy framework set out in the Development Plan Documents, the Council believe that the proposed allocation will provide well designed homes that will need local housing need as well as provide other local benefits including the provision of amenity space and enhancements to green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
749	David	Cottle	GB5	The infrastructure can not cope at present. Roads are congested and in poor condition and medical facilities are inaccessible without a car. Further housing will put additional pressures on local infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.  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.  The condition of the road network and its maintenance are the responsibility of the County Highways Authority (CHA). It is recommended that any maintenance issues are reported to the CHA for their consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
749	David	Cottle	GB5	More housing in the borough is essential but should be closer to central Woking where it can be supported. The surrounding small towns and villages can not accommodate further development. Consider areas boarded by the A245, A320 and Carlton Road. It is close to the town centre and amenities.	If it is critical that additional green belt land in Byfleet is allocated for additional housing, I would advocate using the land adjacent to the A245 (South of A245 = GB4, and North of the A245 = cricket pitch and associated areas). However, in my view even this will prove challenging as the A245 through Byfleet is already heavily congested and cannot accommodate more peak time traffic. Also consider the A320 and Carlton Road.	<p>The Core Strategy highlights that most new development will be focused in the existing urban areas where there is good access to services and facilities. Woking Town Centre is expected to accommodate a significant amount of growth over the Plan period, as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. The Site Allocations reflects this by identifying a significant number of sites within or adjacent to Woking Town Centre. Nevertheless, development will have to be accommodated in other areas of the Borough to meet residential and economic needs. The Site Allocations DPD assessed a number of sites across the Borough for development purposes and this is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined through the provision of infrastructure and well designed developments.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion for development between the A245 and A320 near Carlton Road. As set out on the Proposals Map, this area is within Zone A of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, where residential development is not permitted. This is a European designation for wildlife and habitat conservation.</p> <p>The Council has not previously considered the land to the north of the A245 (the cricket club and playing field) as they are important sports and recreation facilities in the area. Nevertheless the Council has considered the site as part of the Sustainability Appraisal and the outcome is that the site is not suitable for development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
749	David	Cottle	GB5	Objects to Green Belt proposal. It is inappropriate to build on the site. Local unspoilt countryside is scarce in the area and been eroded over time. It is essential for the physical, spiritual and mental wellbeing of the local community as well as separating urban areas - a principle of Green Belt.	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 countryside 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. The Council recognises the importance of open space and the countryside and the positive impact it can have on the health and well-being of local residents. As noted above, the Council believe that the amount of land to be removed from the Green Belt is relatively modest and the sites selected in the draft DPD are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives. The proposed development of this site would not result in neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Green Belt review noted that the M25 forms a clear boundary which would provide a settlement limit.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1141	John Gillian	Cotton	GB13	We object to use of Green Belt for housing in Surrey. We chose to live here for beautiful open countryside not urban sprawl. It is easy to consider proposals individually not overall. Collectively with others in Woking and Guildford these will be a significant change to the environment.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a responsibility to plan to meet its development needs. Under the duty to cooperate it has been engaging with its neighbouring authorities to ensure that matters of cross boundary significance are fully addressed.</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
1141	John Gillian	Cotton	GB12	We object to use of Green Belt for housing in Surrey. We chose to live here for beautiful open countryside not urban sprawl. It is easy to consider proposals individually not overall. Collectively with others in Woking and Guildford these will be a significant change to the environment.	None stated.	Woking has a responsibility to plan to meet its housing need. In doing so, it has taken into account the housing needs within its Housing Market Area, which include Guildford and Waverley Borough Council's. The Council is required to do that under the Duty to Cooperate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1141	John Gillian	Cotton	GB13	Already significant new properties under construction in Ripley, which will satisfy demand but put additional pressure on local road. Need to consider the reality of road - we all have cars, bottlenecks at the canal river junctions and access to M25/A3, M3 and stations. It is not possible for everyone to live in S.E. England, there is a lack of affordable housing. We should be discouraging not encouraging people from coming here. we are not convinced of the need for the developments.	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 proposals are intended to meet locally identified needs of the area. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1141	John Gillian	Cotton	GB12	Already significant new properties under construction in Ripley, which will satisfy demand but put additional pressure on local road. Need to consider the reality of road - we all have cars, bottlenecks at the canal river junctions and access to M25/A3, M3 and stations. It is not possible for everyone to live in S.E. England, there is a lack of affordable housing. We should be discouraging not encouraging people from coming here. we are not convinced of the need for the developments.	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 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
1646	A	Couter	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				being identified or suitable. Mayford does not have good access to jobs, infrastructure or services and therefore does not satisfy the sequential approach criteria.			
1646	A	Couter	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.	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	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
1646	A	Couter	GB7	Object to 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	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
1646	A	Couter	GB9	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	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
1646	A	Couter	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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).	
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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 Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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	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
				inappropriate development			
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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</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 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.	
1646	A	Couter	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.</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
1646	A	Couter	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. 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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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.</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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1646	A	Couter	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.	<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 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</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 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.	
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	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
1646	A	Couter	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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 road 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
1646	A	Couter	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 road 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
1646	A	Couter	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 road 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
1646	A	Couter	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 road 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
1646	A	Couter	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	No further modification is 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.	
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1646	A	Couter	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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	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
				buffer.			
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.		sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 fields 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 fields 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 fields 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 fields 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Traveller related business activities would be out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.12. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	The site does not have safe and reasonable access to schools or other local facilities, as there are virtually no local facilities in Mayford village.	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to edge of centre sites with good access to jobs, shops and infrastructure. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, 9.0, and 11.0. There is potential for improvements to local infrastructure and services in Mayford, as outlined in Section 3.0 of Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Further to this, there is the opportunity at Site GB9 Egley Road Garden Centre to provide an element of small scale retail and/or community development, to enhance the currently rather dispersed provision in the Mayford area, and better meet the day to day needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area considered before the Green Belt. No urban sites have been considered, and doubts the validity of there being no other sites across the whole Borough that are identified or suitable.	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Accepts the proposed school as a special purpose for Green Belt land and supportive of associated mitigation measures. However, objects strongly to the leisure centre, running track and sports pitches (and associated café, parking and access) which will have major impacts on an already overloaded and unexpandable road system and is inappropriate within a residential area due to its impacts, and conflicts with the Council's stated 800m separation policy. The association of the leisure and sports proposal with the school proposal represents a lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted. 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 does 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. 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, which has granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities (this decision has not been called in by the Secretary of State). It is not considered that there has been a lack of transparency through this proposal, and the Council's standard procedures in terms of public consultation and availability of planning application documents have been followed.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to 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. Further to this, 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to 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. Further to this, 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to 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. Further to this, 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	No further modification is 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 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>	
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to 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. Further to this, 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. With regard to the justification for the development in a Green Belt location, this is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village as an isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings. There will be a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents who chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village as an isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings. There will be a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents who chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village as an isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings. There will be a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents who chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village as an isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings. There will be a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents who chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban,	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				environment.			
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	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 necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	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 necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	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 necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	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 necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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 Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB7	Please take these objections seriously. WBC should protect and value the visual and historic diversity of its area. I chose to live in a village, which you committed to protect and not a suburb of a town. Please don't destroy the village which has existed for more than 1,000 years.	None stated.	All representations will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. Section 1.0 of this paper also provides justification for this development. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	Please take these objections seriously. WBC should protect and value the visual and historic diversity of its area. I chose to live in a village, which you committed to protect and not a suburb of a town. Please don't destroy the village which has existed for more than 1,000 years.	None stated.	All representations will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. Section 1.0 of this paper also provides justification for this development. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	Please take these objections should protect and value the visual and historic diversity of its area. I chose to live in a village, which you committed to protect and not a suburb of a town. Please don't destroy the village which has existed for more than 1,000 years.	None stated.	All representations will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. Section 1.0 of this paper also provides justification for this development. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	Please take these objections should protect and value the visual and historic diversity of its area. I chose to live in a village, which you committed to protect and not a suburb of a town. Please don't destroy the village which has existed for more than 1,000 years.	None stated.	All representations will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. Section 1.0 of this paper also provides justification for this development. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	Please take these objections should protect and value the visual and historic diversity of its area. I chose to live in a village, which you committed to protect and not a suburb of a town. Please don't destroy the village which has existed for more than 1,000 years.	None stated.	All representations will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. Section 1.0 of this paper also provides justification for this development. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	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. With regard to the part of the representation about Mayford becoming part of 'Greater Woking' please refer to Section 12.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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	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	No further modification is 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, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.		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. With regard to the part of the representation about Mayford becoming part of 'Greater Woking' please refer to Section 12.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	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. With regard to the part of the representation about Mayford becoming part of 'Greater Woking' please refer to Section 12.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	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. With regard to the part of the representation about Mayford becoming part of 'Greater Woking' please refer to Section 12.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane, which is narrow and single lane is places, is ridiculous, and there is already significant traffic. There are also single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points from all approach directions.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane, which is narrow and single lane is places, is ridiculous, and there is already significant traffic. There are also single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points from all approach directions.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane, which is narrow and single lane is places, is ridiculous, and there is already significant traffic. There are also single lane bridge	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and tunnel pinch points from all approach directions.			
1512	J.S.	Cowan	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane, which is narrow and single lane is places, is ridiculous, and there is already significant traffic. There are also single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points from all approach directions.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
1512	J.S.	Cowan	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB8	Strong objections to proposals for Mayford for housing, based on the following;  Insurability of the area for further development - area proposed for development north of Saunders Lane is sloped. In downpours water runs down onto Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane. The Green Lane footpath becomes a small stream. Dog walkers know how wet the ground can be. The area is currently wooded or fields, apart from one cultivated area. Development replacing natural flood defences will increase flood risk to dwellings and railway line to the south. Drainage is a constant problem, there have been a number of works to improve this on Hook Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane; a thorough review of drainage and flood risk is needed.	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 evidence shows that the site can be developed without adverse impacts on the escarpment or risk to flooding. The site can also be developed without exacerbating flood risk elsewhere. The matter in which flooding issues to inform the Site Allocations Did has been addressed is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, 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 allocations 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. In accordance with national and local planning policies, Su will be introduced to minimise the scale of any surface run off on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB8	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - shocking lack of plans to develop local infrastructure to support housing development is disturbing. There are single line bridges, some with traffic lights, narrow road, paths are poor or non existent, little scope to widen road, increased danger to pedestrians and motorists from traffic and congestion, dangerous junction between Black Horse Road and Saunders Lane, narrow road will become rat runs.  Existing parking issues for Saunders Lane residents. Transport infrastructure is inadequate with poor local bus	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				services and small railway station; it will not support the increased demand, exacerbating traffic congestion, especially at peak times. Need more pedestrian crossings for road safety. It would be useful to see how cyclists will be accommodated safely on local road.		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	
151	Mary	Cowland	GB8	There will be pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries from increased population. The existing GP infrastructure is already under pressure. Lack of medical infrastructure will place strain on A & E local hospitals. There is a poor broadband service in Mayford, with no fast broadband.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB8	Threat to conservation areas and wildlife - conservation areas at Prey and Smarts Heaths (pockets of Special Scientific Interest) will be put under severe strain as increased population uses a reduced green space. Proper protection is needed. North of Saunders Lane is mixed fields, hedgerows small woodland areas and wildlife corridors, these will disappear and valuable wildlife displaced and destroyed. The home for various bird, insects, mammals, reptiles, wild plants and trees will be lost. This area is well used as a local community natural resource, as 'green lungs', but will be lost. There needs to be a comprehensive bat and reptile survey before moving forward as many are protected species.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB8	Lack of proper independent research of brown field sites for alternatives - need a proper independent review of possible brown field sites for development, to show that it has proceeded in good faith to investigate possibilities before despoiling local communities. Surprised a supermarket was allowed to build in Sheerwater, an ideal area for housing development.	None stated.	The Council has already assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet the quantity and nature and type of housing needed between 2022 and 2027. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is no need for independent research of brownfield land as the Council considers the existing evidence to be sufficiently robust.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB9	Strong objections to proposals for Mayford for housing, based on the following; Insurability of the area for further development - area proposed for development north of Saunders Lane is sloped. In downpours water runs down onto Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane. The Green Lane footpath becomes a small stream. Dog walkers know how wet the ground can be. The area is currently wooded or fields, apart from one cultivated area. Development replacing natural flood defences will increase flood risk to dwellings and railway line to the south. Drainage is a constant problem, there have been a number of works to improve this on Hook Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane; a thorough review of drainage and flood risk is needed.	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 evidence shows that the site can be developed without adverse impacts on the escarpment or risk to flooding. The site can also be developed without exacerbating flood risk elsewhere. The matter in which flooding issues to inform the Site Allocations Did has been addressed is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, 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 allocations 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. In accordance with national and local planning policies, Su will be introduced to minimise the scale of any surface run off on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB9	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - shocking lack of plans to develop local infrastructure to support housing development is disturbing. There are single line bridges, some with traffic lights, narrow road, paths are poor or non existent, little scope to widen road, increased danger to pedestrians and motorists from traffic and congestion, dangerous junction between Black Horse 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	No further modification is 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 Saunders Lane, narrow road will become rat runs.  Existing parking issues for Saunders Lane residents. Transport infrastructure is inadequate with poor local bus services and small railway station; it will not support the increased demand, exacerbating traffic congestion, especially at peak times. Need more pedestrian crossings for road safety. It would be useful to see how cyclists will be accommodated safely on local road.		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.	
151	Mary	Cowland	GB9	There will be pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries from increased population. The existing GP infrastructure is already under pressure. Lack of medical infrastructure will place strain on A & E local hospitals. There is a poor broadband service in Mayford, with no fast broadband.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB9	Threat to conservation areas and wildlife - conservation areas at Prey and Smarts Heaths (pockets of Special Scientific Interest) will be put under severe strain as increased population uses a reduced green space. Proper protection is needed. North of Saunders Lane is mixed fields, hedgerows small woodland areas and wildlife corridors, these will disappear and valuable wildlife displaced and destroyed. The home for various bird, insects, mammals, reptiles, wild plants and trees will be lost. This area is well used as a local community natural resource, as 'green lungs', but will be lost. There needs to be a comprehensive bat and reptile survey before moving forward as many are protected species.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB9	Lack of proper independent research of brown field sites for alternatives - need a proper independent review of possible brown field sites for development, to show that it has proceeded in good faith to investigate possibilities before despoiling local communities. Surprised a supermarket was allowed to build in Sheerwater, an ideal area for housing development.	None stated.	The Council has already assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet the quantity and nature and type of housing needed between 2022 and 2027. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is no need for independent research of brownfield land as the Council considers the existing evidence to be sufficiently robust.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB10	Strong objections to proposals for Mayford for housing, based on the following;  Insurability of the area for further development - area proposed for development north of Saunders Lane is sloped. In downpours water runs down onto Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane. The Green Lane footpath becomes a small stream. Dog walkers know how wet the ground can be. The area is currently wooded or fields, apart from one cultivated area. Development replacing natural flood defences will increase flood risk to dwellings and railway line to the south. Drainage is a constant problem, there have been a number of works to improve this on Hook Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane; a thorough review of drainage and flood risk is needed.	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. The proposals in Mayford are justified by the available evidence as detailed in Section 8 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 comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
151	Mary	Cowland	GB10	<p>Poor local infrastructure to support further development - shocking lack of plans to develop local infrastructure to support housing development is disturbing. There are single line bridges, some with traffic lights, narrow road, paths are poor or non existent, little scope to widen road, increased danger to pedestrians and motorists from traffic and congestion, dangerous junction between Black Horse Road and Saunders Lane, narrow road will become rat runs.</p> <p>Existing parking issues for Saunders Lane residents. Transport infrastructure is inadequate with poor local bus services and small railway station; it will not support the increased demand, exacerbating traffic congestion, especially at peak times. Need more pedestrian crossings for road safety. It would be useful to see how cyclists will be accommodated safely on local road.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The 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. Parking to service any proposed development will be in accordance with the parking standards of the Council.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB10	There will be pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries from increased population. The existing GP infrastructure is already under pressure. Lack of medical infrastructure will place strain on A & E local hospitals. There is a poor broadband service in Mayford, with no fast broadband.	None stated.	he 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. Parking to service any proposed development will be in accordance with the parking standards of the Council. 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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB10	Threat to conservation areas and wildlife - conservation areas at Prey and Smarts Heaths (pockets of Special Scientific Interest) will be put under severe strain as increased population uses a reduced green space. Proper protection is needed. North of Saunders Lane is mixed fields, hedgerows small woodland areas and wildlife corridors, these will disappear and valuable wildlife displaced and destroyed. The home for various bird, insects, mammals, reptiles, wild plants and trees will be lost. This area is well used as a local community natural resource, as 'green lungs', but will be lost. There needs to be a comprehensive bat and reptile survey before moving forward as many are protected species.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB10	Lack of proper independent research of brown field sites for alternatives - need a proper independent review of possible brown field sites for development, to show that it has proceeded in good faith to investigate possibilities before despoiling local communities. Surprised a supermarket was allowed to build in Sheerwater, an ideal area for housing development.	None stated.	The Council has already assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet the quantity and nature and type of housing needed between 2022 and 2027. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is no need for independent research of brownfield land as the Council considers the existing evidence to be sufficiently robust.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB11	Strong objections to proposals for Mayford for housing, based on the following; Insurability of the area for further development - area proposed for development north of Saunders Lane is sloped. In downpours water runs down	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. The proposals in Mayford are justified by the available evidence as detailed in Section 8 of 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
				onto Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane. The Green Lane footpath becomes a small stream. Dog walkers know how wet the ground can be. The area is currently wooded or fields, apart from one cultivated area. Development replacing natural flood defences will increase flood risk to dwellings and railway line to the south. Drainage is a constant problem, there have been a number of works to improve this on Hook Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane; a thorough review of drainage and flood risk is needed.		Topic Paper. The overall 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.	
151	Mary	Cowland	GB11	<p>Poor local infrastructure to support further development - shocking lack of plans to develop local infrastructure to support housing development is disturbing. There are single line bridges, some with traffic lights, narrow road, paths are poor or non existent, little scope to widen road, increased danger to pedestrians and motorists from traffic and congestion, dangerous junction between Black Horse Road and Saunders Lane, narrow road will become rat runs.</p> <p>Existing parking issues for Saunders Lane residents. Transport infrastructure is inadequate with poor local bus services and small railway station; it will not support the increased demand, exacerbating traffic congestion, especially at peak times. Need more pedestrian crossings for road safety. It would be useful to see how cyclists will be accommodated safely on local road.</p>	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
151	Mary	Cowland	GB11	There will be pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries from increased population. The existing GP infrastructure is already under pressure. Lack of medical infrastructure will place strain on A & E local hospitals. There is a poor broadband service in Mayford, with no fast broadband.	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. 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</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
						by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	
151	Mary	Cowland	GB11	Threat to conservation areas and wildlife - conservation areas at Prey and Smarts Heaths (pockets of Special Scientific Interest) will be put under severe strain as increased population uses a reduced green space. Proper protection is needed. North of Saunders Lane is mixed fields, hedgerows small woodland areas and wildlife corridors, these will disappear and valuable wildlife displaced and destroyed. The home for various bird, insects, mammals, reptiles, wild plants and trees will be lost. This area is well used as a local community natural resource, as 'green lungs', but will be lost. There needs to be a comprehensive bat and reptile survey before moving forward as many are protected species.	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
151	Mary	Cowland	GB11	Lack of proper independent research of brown field sites for alternatives - need a proper independent review of possible brown field sites for development, to show that it has proceeded in good faith to investigate possibilities before despoiling local communities. Surprised a supermarket was allowed to build in Sheerwater, an ideal area for housing development.	None stated.	The Council has already assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet the quantity and nature and type of housing needed between 2022 and 2027. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is no need for independent research of brownfield land as the Council considers the existing evidence to be sufficiently robust.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Pyrford is a very special rural location. Recently the traffic in the area has significantly increased and it is unlikely that they could be widened or improved. The existing traffic is dangerous and heavily congested at peak times. Local services are under considerable strain.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Pyrford is a very special rural location. Recently the traffic in the area has significantly increased and it is unlikely that they could be widened or improved. The existing traffic is dangerous and heavily congested at peak times.  Local services are under considerable strain.	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 traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Unaware of the Site Allocations DPD process and the requirement to identify land within the Green Belt.  Two letters from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and their advisers were dismissed at the Executive Meeting, resulting in the draft Site Allocations DPD being published for public consultation.	None stated.	The Council is committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This commitment is established in paragraph 1.10 of the Core Strategy. The Council has taken into account necessary information before publishing the DPD, including the views expressed by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Unaware of the Site Allocations DPD process and the requirement to identify land within the Green Belt.  Two letters from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and their advisers were dismissed at the Executive Meeting, resulting in the draft Site Allocations DPD being published for public consultation.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the community. It will continue to take account of public opinion. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites that are being proposed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	The draft Site Allocations DPD has not followed the recommendations of the Green Belt Boundary Review (2014)	None stated.	This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 17 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
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	The draft Site Allocations DPD has not followed the recommendations of the Green Belt Boundary Review (2014)	None stated.	That DPD is informed by a range of studies and they collectively justify the proposed allocations. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Is it acceptable for WBC to proceed with the DPD without acting on the points raised in the letter from PNF?	None stated.	The Council has considered the points raised by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Is it acceptable for WBC to proceed with the DPD without acting on the points raised in the letter from PNF?	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the comments of the Neighbourhood Forum. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Do the Council agree that Pyrford's character, natural landscape and footpaths are important and that it forms a unique asset in 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Do the Council agree that Pyrford's character, natural landscape and footpaths are important and that it forms a unique asset in 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 landscape 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
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Pyrford has unique heritage assets including listed buildings and conservation areas. Would development have an adverse negative impact on these heritage assets.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets of Pyrford. This issues is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Pyrford has unique heritage assets including listed buildings and conservation areas. Would development have an adverse negative impact on these heritage 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Would development result in increased traffic congestion and make the road unsafe? Also, what analysis has been done to assess the road network as existing and post development? This could also have environmental and ecological impacts.	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
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Would development result in increased traffic congestion and make the road unsafe? Also, what analysis has been done to assess the road network as existing and post development? This could also have environmental and ecological impacts.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. 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.	
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Have WBC considered the impact of the proposed developments in Guildford, in particular the impact on traffic and the existing road network on Woking road?	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Have WBC considered the impact of the proposed developments in Guildford, in particular the impact on traffic and the existing road network on Woking road?	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Have ecological, infrastructure and bio-diversity impacts been considered?	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Have ecological, infrastructure and bio-diversity impacts been considered.?	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. 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
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Pyrford Primary School will need to significantly increase to meet future demand. The existing nursery and pre-school facilities are at capacity at present.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Pyrford Primary School will need to significantly increase to meet future demand. The existing nursery and pre-school facilities are at capacity at present.	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
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	Due to the age profile of the area, more elderly care facilities are required.	None stated.	Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy offers an in-principle support for the provision of elderly people's accommodation. Proposal GB16 is a mixed use allocation to include elderly people's accommodation. The needs of the elderly is recognised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	Due to the age profile of the area, more elderly care facilities are required.	None stated.	Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy offers an in-principle support for the provision of elderly people's accommodation. Proposal GB16 is a mixed use allocation to include elderly people's accommodation. The needs of the elderly is recognised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB12	The village is a place where people want to live. Safety is of paramount importance and the character of the village could be destroyed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	GB13	The village is a place where people want to live. Safety is of paramount importance and the character of the village could be destroyed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular 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 and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
28	Paul	Cowtan	General	Consider that development would change the character of the village. Perhaps increasing supply of smaller accommodation for mature citizens could free up family sized housing.  What brownfield sites and what other locations with direct access to A Roads with good traffic routes to other areas have been considered?	None stated.	Alternative sites in the urban area and within the Green Belt have been assessed before the proposed allocations were selected. The allocations will provide a range of house types to enable people to downsize to smaller accommodation if they wish to do so. The special character of Mayford is recognised and the Core Strategy has specific policies to protect its character. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the sites identified in the area can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the overall character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB10	Objects to the removal of these sites from Green Belt and proposals to build houses. Urban sprawl will be increased, which the purpose of Green Belt should prevent, while maintaining open space between towns and villages. The proposals do the opposite.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB11	Objects to the removal of these sites from Green Belt and proposals to build houses. Urban sprawl will be increased, which the purpose of Green Belt should prevent, while maintaining open space between towns and villages. The proposals do the opposite.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB14	Objects to the removal of these sites from Green Belt and proposals to build houses. Urban sprawl will be increased,	None stated.	This representation has been 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				which the purpose of Green Belt should prevent, while maintaining open space between towns and villages. The proposals do the opposite.			of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, mostly unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic congestion in the village is an issue at peak hours.	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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, mostly unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic congestion in the village is an issue at peak hours.	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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB14	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, mostly unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic congestion in the village is an issue at peak hours.	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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB10	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need.	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 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB11	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need.	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 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB14	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need.	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 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended sites GB10 and GB11 for development on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, there is no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, 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 relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended sites GB10 and GB11 for development on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, there is no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, 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 relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to	No further modification is 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 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.	
610	Caroline	Cox	GB14	The Green Belt Review recommended sites GB10 and GB11 for development on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, there is no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, 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 relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
610	Caroline	Cox	GB10	The GBR's recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes) using Google maps travel times. 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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB11	The GBR's recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes) using Google maps travel times. 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
610	Caroline	Cox	GB14	The GBR's recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes) using Google maps travel times. 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
674	Karen	Cox	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB9	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development.	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 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.	No further modification is 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 impact of the proposed school at GB8 on air quality has been considered by the Council. This is set out within the Officers Report to the Planning Committee, paragraph 137 to 140.	
674	Karen	Cox	GB10	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development.	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 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 impact of the proposed school at GB8 on air quality has been considered by the Council. This is set out within the Officers Report to the Planning Committee, paragraph 137 to 140.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB11	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development.	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 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 impact of the proposed school at GB8 on air quality has been considered by the Council. This is set out within the Officers Report to the Planning Committee, paragraph 137 to 140.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development and a new school.	None stated.	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. The Council current monitors air quality levels in the Borough. Where necessary, the Council will designate areas with poor air quality as Air Quality Management Areas. This approach has not been taken along Egley Road but the Council will continue to monitor air quality throughout the Borough to make sure it does not exceed the legal limit.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	Egley Road is in the Green Belt and building leisure facilities on the site does not meet the requirements of Very Special Circumstances.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB7	Object to increasing the number of Travellers Pitches at this site. Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	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
674	Karen	Cox	GB9	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
674	Karen	Cox	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
674	Karen	Cox	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
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.	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 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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.	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 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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.	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 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.	No further modification is 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>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>	
674	Karen	Cox	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.	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. 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 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
674	Karen	Cox	GB7	Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site previously because they would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB9	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	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 Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	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.	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
						In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
674	Karen	Cox	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development and a new school.	None stated.	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. The Council current monitors air quality levels in the Borough. Where necessary, the Council will designate areas with poor air quality as Air Quality Management Areas. This approach has not been taken along Egley Road but the Council will continue to monitor air quality throughout the Borough to make sure it does not exceed the legal limit.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
675	Cliff	Cox	GB9	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development and a new school.	None stated.	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. The Council current monitors air quality levels in the Borough. Where necessary, the Council will designate areas with poor air quality as Air Quality Management Areas. This approach has not been taken along Egley Road but the Council will continue to monitor air quality throughout the Borough to make sure it does not exceed the legal limit.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB10	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development and a new school.	None stated.	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. The Council current monitors air quality levels in the Borough. Where necessary, the Council will designate areas with poor air quality as Air Quality Management Areas. This approach has not been taken along Egley Road but the Council will continue to monitor air quality throughout the Borough to make sure it does not exceed the legal limit.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB11	Air quality on Constitution Hill exceed recommended levels and likely to be the same on Egley Road. It is a material consideration in terms of planning and likely to get worse with development and a new school.	None stated.	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. The Council current monitors air quality levels in the Borough. Where necessary, the Council will designate areas with poor air quality as Air Quality Management Areas. This approach has not been taken along Egley Road but the Council will continue to monitor air quality throughout the Borough to make sure it does not exceed the legal limit.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	Egley Road is in the Green Belt and building leisure facilities on the site does not meet the requirements of Very Special Circumstances.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB7	Object to increasing the number of Travellers Pitches at this site. Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	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
675	Cliff	Cox	GB9	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
675	Cliff	Cox	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
675	Cliff	Cox	GB11	Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>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>		<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>	of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	<p>Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.</p>	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. 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 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
675	Cliff	Cox	GB9	<p>Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.</p>	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> <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
675	Cliff	Cox	GB10	<p>Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.</p>	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. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. 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.	
675	Cliff	Cox	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Pollution levels will also affect human and animal health.	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> <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
675	Cliff	Cox	GB7	Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site previously because they would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB9	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB10	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB11	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
675	Cliff	Cox	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
675	Cliff	Cox	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and the road are already congested. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people using the station with no footpath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1142	Jean	Cox	GB13	I object to use of Green Belt land. The area does not have enough land for the infrastructure needed. The local school and health centre are already stretched. I can see no other provision in the 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 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
1142	Jean	Cox	GB12	I object to use of Green Belt land. The area does not have enough land for the infrastructure needed. The local school and health centre are already stretched. I can see no other provision in the 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1432	Peter	Cox	General	Butlers Well, Pyle Hill, Woking, GU22 0SR. Would like to make this land (a 9 acre field next to my home) available for potential future development	None stated.	The site has been assessed and based on the evidence the Council does not intend to take it forward as a Site Allocation in this DPD. The reasons for this are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1432	Peter	Cox	General	Submitting the site below, which I own, for potential future development. Butlers Well, Pyle Hill, Woking, GU22 0SR. Land Registry Title Number SY 567392. The plot would be better used for a house, in keeping with the rest of the road.	None stated.	The site has been assessed and based on the evidence the Council does not intend to take it forward as a Site Allocation in this DPD. The reasons for this are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1437	Alan	Cox	GB12	WBC has ignored approaches and representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and its professional advisors. This is both discourteous and unbecoming of an elected body and likely to be counter-productive if at a later stage those representations are found to contain substantive points, previously ignored. Urges the Council to take these representations seriously now.	Take the previously ignored approaches and representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and its professional advisors seriously now.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation, and may be why a response has appeared to be delayed. However, all responses to Council consultations are taken seriously. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1437	Alan	Cox	GB13	WBC has ignored approaches and representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and its professional advisors. This is both discourteous and unbecoming of an elected body and likely to be counter-productive if at a later stage those representations are found to contain substantive points, previously ignored. Urges the Council to take these representations seriously now.	Take the previously ignored approaches and representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and its professional advisors seriously now.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation, and may be why a response has appeared to be delayed. However, all responses to Council consultations are taken seriously. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1437	Alan	Cox	GB12	Understand that WBC is proposing take these two fields out of the Green Belt. Objects as the fields make a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area and the character of Pyrford. Their loss to housing will have a detrimental effect on the attractiveness of Pyrford as a place to live.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. In addition, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1437	Alan	Cox	GB13	Understand that WBC is proposing take these two fields out of the Green Belt. Objects as the fields make a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area and the character of Pyrford. Their loss to housing will have a detrimental effect on the attractiveness of Pyrford as a place to live.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. In addition, 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	No further modification is 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>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.</p>	
1437	Alan	Cox	GB12	Understand that WBC is proposing to grant planning permission for 423 houses on the two fields. Objects as infrastructure will be unable sustain the impact of these homes unless substantial improvements are made. The road network is barely able to cope as it is, schools and health services are already under pressure and operating at or beyond capacity.	None stated.	This document, the draft Site Allocation DPD, does not grant planning permission for any site, but sets out the policy framework and sites to deliver the development requirements of the Borough. Any development would need to be considered to adequately meet the Development Plan's requirements before the Council grants planning permission. The representation has been further 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
1437	Alan	Cox	GB13	Understand that WBC is proposing to grant planning permission for 423 houses on the two fields. Objects as infrastructure will be unable sustain the impact of these homes unless substantial improvements are made. The road network is barely able to cope as it is, schools and health services are already under pressure and operating at or beyond capacity.	None stated.	This document, the draft Site Allocation DPD, does not grant planning permission for any site, but sets out the policy framework and sites to deliver the development requirements of the Borough. Any development would need to be considered to adequately meet the Development Plan's requirements before the Council grants planning permission. The representation has been further 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
1437	Alan	Cox	GB12	Understand that WBC is proposing to classify the land north east of Pyrford Common Road as unsuitable for designation as Green Belt. Objects as this is blatantly and demonstrably incorrect. This is simply a back door way of opening up land to facilitate the widening of Pyrford Common Road to support A and B above [to improve a part of the current road infrastructure to support development].	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. It should be noted that the proposed allocation is not a way of facilitating the widening of Pyrford Common Road, which would in itself require consultation, although improvements to transport infrastructure will be made to support development. This is detailed in Sections 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper and in the key requirements of the draft allocation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1437	Alan	Cox	GB13	Understand that WBC is proposing to classify the land north east of Pyrford Common Road as unsuitable for designation as Green Belt. Objects as this is blatantly and demonstrably incorrect. This is simply a back door way of opening up land to facilitate the widening of Pyrford Common Road to support A and B above [to improve a part of the current road infrastructure to support development].	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. It should be noted that the proposed allocation is not a way of facilitating the widening of Pyrford Common Road, which would in itself require consultation, although improvements to transport infrastructure will be made to support development. This is detailed in Sections 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper and in the key requirements of the draft allocation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1684	James	Cox	GB15	The area suffers with flooding and development will make this situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1684	James	Cox	GB15	Object to development of Green Belt land at West Hall. The volume of traffic on the A245 is already a problem and additional development will make the situation worse. The 2010 transport study does not factor in development in this location and is therefore not correct when considering this 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. 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 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 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 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1684	James	Cox	GB15	West Byfleet is stretched for infrastructure and will not cope with additional development. It will have a negative impact on local people and is of concern that is not recognised in the proposals.	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
1684	James	Cox	GB15	The medical facilities are at capacity and 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
1684	James	Cox	GB15	Schools are at capacity by 2019 and would not be able to support further population increases.	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
1684	James	Cox	GB15	The proposals will impact the limited Green Belt in the area and it acts as a natural noise and environmental buffer.	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. The environmental impact of the proposed allocation has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental indicators. The appraisal alongside the other documents within the Council's evidence base indicate that the site is suitable for development whilst making sure that the Green Belt is not undermined in its overall purpose and integrity. The 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 development near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1684	James	Cox	GB15	The rail links to West Byfleet are insufficient in terms of frequency and time to London. Increase in housing will require improvements to the service, have SWT agreed to this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	It is understood that the decision to release land from the GB for development was made in 2009 and there is concern that this was not properly consulted on at the time of the decision.  There is also concern that the current consultation has been insufficient, where it is considered that only a short period has been given and most of the publicity has been carried out by the Byfleet Resident Association themselves and not Council staff. It is recommended that the process be reviewed	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9 Section 2.0 and Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	It is understood that the decision to release land from the GB for development was made in 2009 and there is concern that this was not properly consulted on at the time of the decision.  There is also concern that the current consultation has been insufficient, where it is considered that only a short period has been given and most of the publicity has been carried out by the Byfleet Resident Association themselves and not Council staff. It is recommended that the process be reviewed	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9 Section 2.0 and 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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Consider alternative approaches to meeting development needs:1) Consider allocating smaller sites and distributing these evenly around the borough. This is an approach advocated by Princess Anne and CPRE. This is more cost effective than developing one large scheme and would not have the same infrastructure issues.	Consider alternative approaches to meeting development needs:1) Consider allocating smaller sites and distributing these evenly around the borough. This is an approach advocated by Princess Anne and CPRE. This is more cost effective than developing one large scheme and would not have the same infrastructure issues.	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 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Consider alternative approaches to meeting development needs: 1) Consider allocating smaller sites and distributing these evenly around the borough. This is an approach advocated by Princess Anne and CPRE. This is more cost effective than developing one large scheme and would not have the same infrastructure issues.	Consider alternative approaches to meeting development needs: 1) Consider allocating smaller sites and distributing these evenly around the borough. This is an approach advocated by Princess Anne and CPRE. This is more cost effective than developing one large scheme and would not have the same infrastructure issues.	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 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet is an island village with only three entrances/exits and water surrounding it. Its geography means that it is very difficult to add new road or to increase the capacity of existing road. Additional development will exacerbate the	None stated.	With respect to the representation regarding the suitability of sites, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0, particularly 1.13.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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				traffic problems in the area.		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 road. 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.	
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet is an island village with only three entrances/exits and water surrounding it. Its geography means that it is very difficult to add new road or to increase the capacity of existing road. Additional development will exacerbate the traffic problems in the area.	None stated.	With respect to the representation regarding the suitability of sites, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0, particularly 1.13. 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 road. 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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	The rep queries the status of Old Manor School, Magdalen Crescent, Byfleet and whether is its available for development	None stated.	The site was assessed through the SHLAA (SHLAABY064) and the Sustainability Appraisal. Although the site is known to be vacant, its former use was as a school and therefore the redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of a community facility and would need to be justified.  At the time of preparing the SHLAA the landowner had not indicated whether current community use was surplus to requirements and whether the site was available, therefore the site was not considered developable or deliverable. (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	The rep queries the status of Old Manor School, Magdalen Crescent, Byfleet and whether is its available for development	None stated.	The site was assessed through the SHLAA (SHLAABY064) and the Sustainability Appraisal. Although the site is known to be vacant, its former use was as a school and therefore the redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of a community facility and would need to be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						At the time of preparing the SHLAA the landowner had not indicated whether current community use was surplus to requirements and whether the site was available, therefore the site was not considered developable or deliverable. (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0)	
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet periodically floods, with significant floods in Dec 2013/2014. Although the GB proposal areas are not located on the areas at most risk of flooding the sites perform an important drainage function to absorb excess water, development on these sites will increase problems in other parts. It is also believed that some areas are within the Flood Zone, therefore if so, this is considered irresponsible. Development should not be built in flood risk areas. Experts on flooding should be appointed to assess the impact of developing on the GB.	Avoid development within flood risk areas. Seek expertise on flooding issues in relation to the release of land from the GB	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The site is not within the Flood Zone but it is adjacent to an area that is within Flood zone 2. This is acknowledged in the site proposal and the site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement. Also, the Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet periodically floods, with significant floods in Dec 2013/2014. Although the GB proposal areas are not located on the areas at most risk of flooding the sites perform an important drainage function to absorb excess water, development on these sites will increase problems in other parts. It is also believed that some areas are within the Flood Zone, therefore if so, this is considered irresponsible. Development should not be built in flood risk areas. Experts on flooding should be appointed to assess the impact of developing on the GB.	Avoid development within flood risk areas. Seek expertise on flooding issues in relation to the release of land from the GB	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0.  The south and eastern parts of the site shown to be within Flood Zone 2, this is acknowledged in the site proposal and the site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement.  Also, the Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	There is concern that insufficient resource has been placed on trying to identify non-GB alternative solutions. Concerned that the alternative approaches have been carried out by Council staff	Resources be invested on trying to identify alternative, non-GB solutions	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	There is concern that insufficient resource has been placed on trying to identify non-GB alternative solutions. Concerned that the alternative approaches have been carried out by Council staff	Resources be invested on trying to identify alternative, non-GB solutions	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, 9.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Ensure alternative solutions have been fully considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings. This is supported by central Government. There should be a thorough assessment of all empty buildings and excess office/retail space. For example 121 Chertsey Road is vacant and unused; The Horizons building on Parvis Road/Brooklands Road, Byfleet and its not used to full capacity.	Ensure alternative solutions have been fully considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings. This is supported by central Government. There should be a thorough assessment of all empty buildings and excess office/retail space. For example 121	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  121 Chertsey Road has been assessed and is included in the Site Allocation as part of UA33. The Council has assessed brownfield sites including empty offices that can be developed for housing and/or alternative uses. See Section 16.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Chertsey Road is vacant and unused; The Horizons building on Parvis Road/Brooklands Road, Byfleet and its not used to full capacity.		
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Ensure alternative solutions have been fully considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings. This is supported by central Government. There should be a thorough assessment of all empty buildings and excess office/retail space. For example 121 Chertsey Road is vacant and unused; The Horizons building on Parvis Road/Brooklands Road, Byfleet and its not used to full capacity.	Ensure alternative solutions have been fully considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings. This is supported by central Government. There should be a thorough assessment of all empty buildings and excess office/retail space. For example 121 Chertsey Road is vacant and unused; The Horizons building on Parvis Road/Brooklands Road, Byfleet and its not used to full capacity.	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 9.2121 Chertsey Road has been assessed and is included in the Site Allocation as part of UA33. The Council has assessed brownfield sites including empty offices that can be developed for housing and/or alternative uses. See Section 16.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Concerns about insufficient consideration of infrastructure provision. It is believed that infrastructure should be considered up front and not as WBC have suggested (during a meeting 16/07/2015) that detailed studies will be carried out alongside a planning application. Considers the process of identifying infrastructure as flawed and that it should be considered in advanced.	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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Concerns about insufficient consideration of infrastructure provision. It is believed that infrastructure should be considered up front and not as WBC have suggested (during a meeting 16/07/2015) that detailed studies will be carried out alongside a planning application. Considers the process of identifying infrastructure as flawed and that it should be considered in advanced.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	<p>Object to proposed release of GB in Byfleet. Considers that Byfleet has been disproportionately allocated more development than other villages in Woking pre and post 2027.</p> <p>Suggest that if a village is to lose some GB land to development then the remaining GB in that village should receive greater protection</p>	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>Unfortunately there is no planning mechanism whereby areas are awarded higher protection because of the perceived uneven distribution of housing in one area. The Green Belt is a strategic designation and the has been treated as such. The methodology for site identification did not seek an even distribution in all War but for the identification of sites in the most sustainable location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	<p>Object to proposed release of GB in Byfleet.Considers that Byfleet has been disproportionately allocated more development than other villages in Woking pre and post 2027. Suggest that if a village is to lose some GB land to development then the remaining GB in that village should receive greater protection</p>	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.Unfortunately there is no planning mechanism whereby areas are awarded higher protection because of the perceived uneven distribution of housing in one area. The Green Belt is a strategic designation and the has been treated as such. The methodology for site identification did not seek an even distribution in all War but for the identification of sites in the most sustainable location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	<p>Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like clarification that it has been considered</p>	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 Representor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	<p>Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like clarification that it has been considered</p>	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 Representor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	<p>Highlights the various infrastructure problems at the moment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-lack of medical facilities (1 in Byfleet and 1 in West Byfleet)</li> <li>- schools are at capacity, where the catchment area for intake reduces every year. Some local children cannot go to local schools.</li> <li>-Significant congestion problems experienced in Byfleet particularly on Parvis Road</li> <li>-The trains are over capacity (statistics provided)</li> <li>-existing flooding problems will increase through more building and drains overflowing</li> </ul>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 5.0, 20.0 and 24.0</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>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</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
						also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Highlights the various infrastructure problems at the moment, including:-lack of medical facilities (1 in Byfleet and 1 in West Byfleet)- schools are at capacity, where the catchment area for intake reduces every year. Some local children cannot go to local schools.-Significant congestion problems experienced in Byfleet particularly on Parvis Road-The trains are over capacity (statistics provided)-existing flooding problems will increase through more building and drains overflowing	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 5.0, 20.0 and 24.0The 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. 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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Concerned that the sites have been selected predominantly on the basis that they are available and the landowners are willing to sell these for maximum profit rather than on its suitability and appropriateness.	None stated.	<p>Whilst it important to note that availability is an important material consideration to provide certainty of delivery (this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0).</p> <p>It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and 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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Concerned that the sites have been selected predominantly on the basis that they are available and the landowners are willing to sell these for maximum profit rather than on its suitability and appropriateness.	None stated.	<p>Whilst it important to note that availability is an important material consideration to provide certainty of delivery (this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0).</p> <p>It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and 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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	The proposals would create urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	The proposals would create urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Queries the evidence on future office and retail provision. The projected growth is not realistic. The targets should be reduced and empty shops/offices should be utilised for housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Queries the evidence on future office and retail provision. The projected growth is not realistic. The targets should be reduced and empty shops/offices should be utilised for housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
321	Paul	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet has the least open spaces and GB land. It is unfair to target the area and reduce its supply further. Other areas have a high ratio of green space per population, the proposals will remove almost all of GB here whilst leaving other parts of the Borough untouched.	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
321	Paul	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet has the least open spaces and GB land. It is unfair to target the area and reduce its supply further. Other areas have a high ratio of green space per population, the proposals will remove almost all of GB here whilst leaving other parts of the Borough untouched.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	A study of Byfleet's infrastructure should be undertaken prior to development, and used to determine the proposed level of house building. Does not feel the infrastructure in and around Byfleet can support any significant development.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	A study of Byfleet's infrastructure should be undertaken prior to development, and used to determine the proposed level of house building. Does not feel the infrastructure in and around Byfleet can support any significant development.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	A study of Byfleet's infrastructure should be undertaken prior to development, and used to determine the proposed level of house building. Does not feel the infrastructure in and around Byfleet can support any significant development.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	A study of Byfleet's infrastructure should be undertaken prior to development, and used to determine the proposed level of house building. Does not feel the infrastructure in and around Byfleet can support any significant development.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	A study of Byfleet's infrastructure should be undertaken prior to development, and used to determine the proposed level of house building. Does not feel the infrastructure in and around Byfleet can support any significant development.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet frequently floods. The proposed sites are adjacent to major flood areas and therefore are essential in absorbing excess water. Developing the sites will reduce their current absorption capacity and result in worse floods, which will spread to other	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
				areas that have been previously unaffected. The area should be assessed by experts to understand this flood risk before the proposals progress.			
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet frequently floods. The proposed sites are adjacent to major flood areas and therefore are essential in absorbing excess water. Developing the sites will reduce their current absorption capacity and result in worse floods, which will spread to other areas that have been previously unaffected. The area should be assessed by experts to understand this flood risk before the proposals progress.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Byfleet frequently floods. The proposed sites are adjacent to major flood areas and therefore are essential in absorbing excess water. Developing the sites will reduce their current absorption capacity and result in worse floods, which will spread to other areas that have been previously unaffected. The area should be assessed by experts to understand this flood risk before the proposals progress.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Byfleet frequently floods. The proposed sites are adjacent to major flood areas and therefore are essential in absorbing excess water. Developing the sites will reduce their current absorption capacity and result in worse floods, which will spread to other areas that have been previously unaffected. The area should be assessed by experts to understand this flood risk before the proposals progress.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Byfleet frequently floods. The proposed sites are adjacent to major flood areas and therefore are essential in absorbing excess water. Developing the sites will reduce their current absorption capacity and result in worse floods, which will spread to other areas that have been previously unaffected. The area should be assessed by experts to understand this flood risk before the proposals progress.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Concerned that the only paid for external report was the GBBR. The same level of resources should be applied to finding non-Green Belt sites. All non Green Belt approaches have been carried out by Council staff.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Concerned that the only paid for external report was the GBBR. The same level of resources should be applied to finding non-Green Belt sites. All non Green Belt approaches have been carried out by Council staff.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Concerned that the only paid for external report was the GBBR. The same level of resources should be applied to finding non-Green Belt sites. All non Green Belt approaches have been carried out by Council staff.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Concerned that the only paid for external report was the GBBR. The same level of resources should be applied to finding non-Green Belt sites. All non Green Belt approaches have been carried out by Council staff.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Concerned that the only paid for external report was the GBBR. The same level of resources should be applied to finding non-Green Belt sites. All non Green Belt approaches have been carried out by Council staff.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	The Council should undertake a different approach of smaller scale developments, evenly spread with villages and towns given set percentages of additional houses to accommodate. This is more appropriate and will evenly distribute the population, reducing the impact on infrastructure. This	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of the Borough. This includes a significant amount of development within Woking Town Centre as well as in other urban areas.  As set out in the DPD, the Site Allocations DPD only considers strategic sites that can 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
				approach is advocated by Princess Anne and the Campaign for Rural England. This approach may be more administratively complex and take longer.		<p>10 dwellings or more or commercial and retail sites of over 500sqm. This is not to say that smaller sites can not or will not come forward for development. However these smaller sites on their own cannot deliver enough development to meet the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings as well as a significant amount of retail and commercial floor space. Based on the Council's evidence it is considered that the proposed sites are in the most sustainable locations to meet development needs when compared against other alternatives. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	The Council should undertake a different approach of smaller scale developments, evenly spread with villages and towns given set percentages of additional houses to accommodate. This is more appropriate and will evenly distribute the population, reducing the impact on infrastructure. This approach is advocated by Princess Anne and the Campaign for Rural England. This approach may be more administratively complex and take longer.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of the Borough. This includes a significant amount of development within Woking Town Centre as well as in other urban areas.</p> <p>As set out in the DPD, the Site Allocations DPD only considers strategic sites that can deliver 10 dwellings or more or commercial and retail sites of over 500sqm. This is not to say that smaller sites can not or will not come forward for development. However these smaller sites on their own cannot deliver enough development to meet the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings as well as a significant amount of retail and commercial floor space. Based on the Council's evidence it is considered that the proposed sites are in the most sustainable locations to meet development needs when compared against other alternatives. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	The Council should undertake a different approach of smaller scale developments, evenly spread with villages and towns given set percentages of additional houses to accommodate. This is more appropriate and will evenly distribute the population, reducing the impact on infrastructure. This approach is advocated by Princess Anne and the Campaign for Rural England. This approach may be more administratively complex and take longer.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of the Borough. This includes a significant amount of development within Woking Town Centre as well as in other urban areas. As set out in the DPD, the Site Allocations DPD only considers strategic sites that can deliver 10 dwellings or more or commercial and retail sites of over 500sqm. This is not to say that smaller sites can not or will not come forward for development. However these smaller sites on their own cannot deliver enough development to meet the development needs of the Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings as well as a significant amount of retail and commercial floor space. Based on the Council's evidence it is considered that the proposed sites are in the most sustainable locations to meet development needs when compared against other alternatives. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	The Council should undertake a different approach of smaller scale developments, evenly spread with villages and towns given set percentages of additional houses to accommodate. This is more appropriate and will evenly distribute the population, reducing the impact on infrastructure. This approach is advocated by Princess Anne and the Campaign for Rural England. This approach may be more administratively complex and take longer.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of the Borough. This includes a significant amount of development within Woking Town Centre as well as in other urban areas.</p> <p>As set out in the DPD, the Site Allocations DPD only considers strategic sites that can deliver 10 dwellings or more or commercial and retail sites of over 500sqm. This is not to say that smaller sites can not or will not come forward for development. However these smaller sites on their own cannot deliver enough development to meet the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings as well as a significant amount of retail and commercial floor space. Based on the Council's evidence it is considered that the proposed sites are in the most sustainable locations to meet development needs when compared against other alternatives. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	The Council should undertake a different approach of smaller scale developments, evenly spread with villages and towns given set percentages of additional houses to accommodate. This is more appropriate and will evenly distribute the population, reducing the impact on infrastructure. This approach is advocated by Princess Anne and the Campaign for Rural England. This approach may be more administratively complex and take longer.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of the Borough. This includes a significant amount of development within Woking Town Centre as well as in other urban areas.</p> <p>As set out in the DPD, the Site Allocations DPD only considers strategic sites that can deliver 10 dwellings or more or commercial and retail sites of over 500sqm. This is not to say that smaller sites can not or will not come forward for development. However these smaller sites on their own cannot deliver enough development to meet the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings as well as a significant amount of retail and commercial floor space. Based on the Council's evidence it is considered that the proposed sites are in the most sustainable locations to meet development needs when compared against other alternatives. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See</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
						Section 9.0 and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet only has 3 entrances due to its geography. Further development will make the situation at these road bottlenecks 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet only has 3 entrances due to its geography. Further development will make the situation at these road bottlenecks 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Byfleet only has 3 entrances due to its geography. Further development will make the situation at these road bottlenecks 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Byfleet only has 3 entrances due to its geography. Further development will make the situation at these road bottlenecks 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Byfleet only has 3 entrances due to its geography. Further development will make the situation at these road bottlenecks 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Byfleet floods and drains overflow with high rainfall. Further development will make the situation 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Byfleet floods and drains overflow with high rainfall. Further development will make the situation 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Byfleet floods and drains overflow with high rainfall. Further development will make the situation 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Byfleet floods and drains overflow with high rainfall. Further development will make the situation 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Byfleet floods and drains overflow with high rainfall. Further development will make the situation 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	There are empty building places to make bringing empty buildings back into use easier. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the number of private owned empty buildings in the Borough.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	There are empty building places to make bringing empty buildings back into use easier. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the number of private owned empty buildings in the Borough.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	There are empty building places to make bringing empty buildings back into use easier. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the number of private owned empty buildings in the Borough.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	There are empty building places to make bringing empty buildings back into use easier. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the number of private owned empty buildings in the Borough.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	There are empty building places to make bringing empty buildings back into use easier. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the number of private owned empty buildings in the Borough.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Questions why the plan included more office and retail space when there is already office and retail units that have been available for a long time. Two examples given – 121 Chertsey Road and Horizons Building on Parvis Road. The 2009 office space projection is flawed and over estimates current and future need for retail and office space. The targets should be reduced and the sites used to meet the housing targets.	None stated.	The representation provides a number of alternative sites for consideration.  Please note that 121 Chertsey Road has been identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD under the reference UA33.  The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas of land to be considered by the Council, but from the description, the 'Horizons' building appears to be outside of the Borough boundary.  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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Questions why the plan included more office and retail space when there is already office and retail units that have been available for a long time. Two examples given – 121 Chertsey Road and Horizons Building on Parvis Road. The 2009 office space projection is flawed and over estimates current and future need for retail and office space. The targets should be reduced and the sites used to meet the housing targets.	None stated.	The representation provides a number of alternative sites for consideration.  Please note that 121 Chertsey Road has been identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD under the reference UA33.  The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas of land to be considered by the Council, but from the description, the 'Horizons' building appears to be outside of the Borough boundary.  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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Questions why the plan included more office and retail space when there is already office and retail units that have been available for a long time. Two examples given – 121 Chertsey Road and Horizons Building on Parvis Road. The 2009 office space projection is flawed and over estimates current and future need for retail and office space. The targets should be reduced and the sites used to meet the housing targets.	None stated.	The representation provides a number of alternative sites for consideration.  Please note that 121 Chertsey Road has been identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD under the reference UA33.  The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas of land to be considered by the Council, but from the description, the 'Horizons' building appears to be outside of the Borough boundary.  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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Questions why the plan included more office and retail space when there is already office and retail units that have been available for a long time. Two examples given – 121 Chertsey Road and Horizons Building on Parvis Road. The 2009 office space projection is flawed and over estimates current and future need for retail and office space. The targets should be reduced and the sites used to meet the housing targets.	None stated.	The representation provides a number of alternative sites for consideration.  Please note that 121 Chertsey Road has been identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD under the reference UA33.  The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas of land to be considered by the Council, but from the description, the 'Horizons' building appears to be outside of the Borough boundary.  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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Questions why the plan included more office and retail space when there is already office and retail units that have been available for a long time. Two examples given – 121 Chertsey Road and Horizons Building on Parvis Road. The 2009 office space projection is flawed and over estimates current and future need for retail and office space. The targets should be reduced and the sites used to meet the housing targets.	None stated.	The representation provides a number of alternative sites for consideration. Please note that 121 Chertsey Road has been identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD under the reference UA33. The representation did not provide any specific details or site plan regarding the areas of land to be considered by the Council, but from the description, the 'Horizons' building appears to be outside of the Borough boundary. 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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	General	Object to the removal of Green Belt status.	None stated.	Objection noted. The need to identify land in the Green Belt for 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	General	Object to the removal of Green Belt status.	None stated.	Objection noted. The need to identify land in the Green Belt for 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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Object to removal of Green Belt. Will lead to the overdevelopment of Byfleet. It is unfair to develop an area with some of the lowest green open spaces and green space per population, and make the situation worse, when there are areas with more green spaces which aren't being developed where the impact would be lower.	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.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Object to removal of Green Belt. Will lead to the overdevelopment of Byfleet. It is unfair to develop an area with some of the lowest green open spaces and green space per population, and make the situation worse, when there are areas with more green spaces which aren't being developed where the impact would be lower.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Object to removal of Green Belt. Will lead to the overdevelopment of Byfleet. It is unfair to develop an area with some of the lowest green open spaces and green space per population, and make the situation worse, when there are areas with more green spaces which aren't being developed where the impact would be lower.	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.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Object to removal of Green Belt. Will lead to the overdevelopment of Byfleet. It is unfair to develop an area with some of the lowest green open spaces and green space per population, and make the situation worse, when there are areas with more green spaces which aren't being developed where the impact would be lower.	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 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). 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Object to removal of Green Belt. Will lead to the overdevelopment of Byfleet. It is unfair to develop an area with some of the lowest green open spaces and green space per population, and make the situation worse, when there are areas with more green spaces which aren't being developed where the impact would be lower.	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 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). 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.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Concerned brownfield options are not being fully utilised and they should be fully explored before Green Belt developments.WBC should respect the Government which recently stated it is not necessary to build on Green Belt land to meet housing targets.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Concerned brownfield options are not being fully utilised and they should be fully explored before Green Belt developments. WBC should respect the Government which recently stated it is not necessary to build on Green Belt land to meet housing targets.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Concerned brownfield options are not being fully utilised and they should be fully explored before Green Belt developments. WBC should respect the Government which recently stated it is not necessary to build on Green Belt land to meet housing targets.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Concerned brownfield options are not being fully utilised and they should be fully explored before Green Belt developments. WBC should respect the Government which recently stated it is not necessary to build on Green Belt land to meet housing targets.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Concerned brownfield options are not being fully utilised and they should be fully explored before Green Belt developments. WBC should respect the Government which recently stated it is not necessary to build on Green Belt land to meet housing targets.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	It is not fair that Byfleet loses Green Belt twice compared to other Woking villages. Any area that loses Green Belt should be given greater protection for their remaining Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate GB15 and GB16 in the Green Belt in West Byfleet for development in this Plan period, as well as a number of other sites in the urban area.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD also proposes to safeguard land in the wider Green Belt for development needs between 2027 and 2040. These sites will be considered in more detail when the Core Strategy is reviewed or during the preparation of the next local plan. This approach is considered to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF).</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 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 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).	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	It is not fair that Byfleet loses Green Belt twice compared to other Woking villages. Any area that loses Green Belt should be given greater protection for their remaining Green Belt.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate GB15 and GB16 in the Green Belt in West Byfleet for development in this Plan period, as well as a number of other sites in the urban area. The draft Site Allocations DPD also proposes to safeguard land in the wider Green Belt for development needs between 2027 and 2040. These sites will be considered in more detail when the Core Strategy is reviewed or during the preparation of the next local plan. This approach is considered to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF). 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 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	It is not fair that Byfleet loses Green Belt twice compared to other Woking villages. Any area that loses Green Belt should be given greater protection for their remaining Green Belt.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate GB15 and GB16 in the Green Belt in West Byfleet for development in this Plan period, as well as a number of other sites in the urban area.  The draft Site Allocations DPD also proposes to safeguard land in the wider Green Belt for development needs between 2027 and 2040. These sites will be considered in more detail when the Core Strategy is reviewed or during the preparation of the next local plan. This approach is considered to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF).  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 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	It is not fair that Byfleet loses Green Belt twice compared to other Woking villages. Any area that loses Green Belt should be given greater protection for their remaining Green Belt.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate one site in Byfleet for development between 2016 and 2027 (UA1). This site is for a mixed use development of residential and community facility. The draft Site Allocations DPD also proposes to safeguard land in the Green Belt for development needs between 2027 and 2040. These sites will be considered in more detail when the Core Strategy is reviewed or during the preparation of the next local plan. This approach is considered to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF). 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 between 2027 and 2040. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	It is not fair that Byfleet loses Green Belt twice compared to other Woking villages. Any area that loses Green Belt should be given greater protection for their remaining Green Belt.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate one site in Byfleet for development between 2016 and 2027 (UA1). This site is for a mixed use development of residential and community facility.  The draft Site Allocations DPD also proposes to safeguard land in the Green Belt 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
						<p>development needs between 2027 and 2040. These sites will be considered in more detail when the Core Strategy is reviewed or during the preparation of the next local plan. This approach is considered to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF).</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 between 2027 and 2040. 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>	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. 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</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
						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. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	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. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	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. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Local children should be able to attend the village school. The distance for admissions is decreasing over time and further development will make the situation worse. There is limited scope to expand the schools further.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Local children should be able to attend the village school. The distance for admissions is decreasing over time and further development will make the situation worse. There is limited scope to expand the schools further.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Local children should be able to attend the village school. The distance for admissions is decreasing over time and further development will make the situation worse. There is limited scope to expand the schools further.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Local children should be able to attend the village school. The distance for admissions is decreasing over time and further development will make the situation worse. There is limited scope to expand the schools further.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Local children should be able to attend the village school. The distance for admissions is decreasing over time and further development will make the situation worse. There is limited scope to expand the schools further.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Would like to know why the Byfleet petition on protecting the Green Belt 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Would like to know why the Byfleet petition on protecting the Green Belt 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Would like to know why the Byfleet petition on protecting the Green Belt 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Would like to know why the Byfleet petition on protecting the Green Belt 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Would like to know why the Byfleet petition on protecting the Green Belt 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	The GP surgeries are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	The GP surgeries are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	The GP surgeries are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	The GP surgeries are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	The GP surgeries are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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	No further modification is 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.	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Concerned that the land has been selected in Byfleet on the basis easy administrative and financial ground, rather than suitability and appropriateness. As it is owned by developers who just want to maximise profits from the site. The reasons why land owned by West Estates has been chosen needs to be independently scrutinised.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Concerned that the land has been selected in Byfleet on the basis easy administrative and financial ground, rather than suitability and appropriateness. As it is owned by developers who just want to maximise profits from the site. The reasons why land owned by West Estates has been chosen needs to be independently scrutinised.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Concerned that the land has been selected in Byfleet on the basis easy administrative and financial ground, rather than suitability and appropriateness. As it is owned by developers who just want to maximise profits from the site. The reasons why land owned by West Estates has been chosen needs to be independently scrutinised.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Concerned that the land has been selected in Byfleet on the basis easy administrative and financial ground, rather than suitability and appropriateness. As it is owned by developers who just want to maximise profits from the site. The reasons why land owned by West Estates has been chosen needs to be independently scrutinised.	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).	No further modification is 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 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 13.0	
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Concerned that the land has been selected in Byfleet on the basis easy administrative and financial ground, rather than suitability and appropriateness. As it is owned by developers who just want to maximise profits from the site. The reasons why land owned by West Estates has been chosen needs to be independently scrutinised.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	General	Documents and questionnaire very difficult to understand, too long and complex. The communication process and questionnaire should be subject to independent scrutiny.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	General	The consultation documents and questionnaire are difficult to understand. They are too long, complex and use jargon not known by the public. The communication process and consultation questionnaire should be subject to an independent scrutiny check to determine if the process has been appropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and 8.0.  I'm sure you will appreciate that the documents are technical documents and by their nature may be complex to understand. In most cases there will be Executive Summaries to summarise the main points.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	General	The consultation documents and questionnaire are difficult to understand. They are too long, complex and use jargon not known by the public. The communication process and consultation questionnaire should be subject to an independent scrutiny check to determine if the process has been appropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and 8.0  I'm sure you will appreciate that the documents are technical documents and by their nature may be complex to understand. In most cases there will be Executive Summaries to summarise the main points.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Will cause 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 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Will cause 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 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Will cause 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 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Will cause 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 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Will cause 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 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB4	Trains from Byfleet are already over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB5	Trains from Byfleet are already over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB15	Trains from Byfleet are already over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB16	Trains from Byfleet are already over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
902	Lynn	Cozens	GB23	Trains from Byfleet are already over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB12	The road network is already 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 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
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB13	The road network is already 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 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB12	The development of this number of houses will cause major infrastructure issues, in particular schools, elderly care, medical provisions and traffic flows.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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 Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate sites across the Borough for specialist accommodation, including elderly care. The Council encourage the development of specialist accommodation to meet the wide ranging housing needs of the Borough. This is set out in Core Strategy policy CS13.</p> <p>In order to facilitate the delivery of the Core Strategy the Council has prepared the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is fully committed to preparing this document in order to bring forward suitable and sustainable sites for the Borough's development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB13	The development of this number of houses will cause major infrastructure issues, in particular schools, elderly care, medical provisions and traffic flows.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been 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. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate sites across the Borough for specialist accommodation, including elderly care. The Council encourage the development of specialist accommodation to meet the wide ranging housing needs of the Borough. This is set out in Core Strategy policy CS13. In order to facilitate the delivery of the Core Strategy the Council has prepared the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is fully committed to preparing this document in order to bring forward suitable and sustainable sites for the Borough's development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB12	Object to development on the site. Pyrford is unique in the Borough because of its CA's and heritage assets. The proposed development will have a disastrous effect on these assets.	None stated.	<p>The heritage assets of Pyrford are well documented as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. Heritage assets are valued both nationally and locally as set out in both the NPPF and Woking Core Strategy.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1009	Jennifer	Cracknell	GB13	Object to development on the site. Pyrford is unique in the Borough because of its CA's and heritage assets. The proposed development will have a disastrous effect on these assets.	None stated.	<p>The heritage assets of Pyrford are well documented as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. Heritage assets are valued both nationally and locally as set out in both the NPPF and Woking Core Strategy.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</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
72	Marie	Craig	GB12	Development would have a negative 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 by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The proposals can be developed without undermining the landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
72	Marie	Craig	GB13	Development would have a negative 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
72	Marie	Craig	GB12	The existing road and hedgerows will be unable to cope with additional traffic and 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
72	Marie	Craig	GB13	The existing road and hedgerows will be unable to cope with additional traffic and 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
72	Marie	Craig	GB13	The site was not considered suitable in the GBBR and development should be resisted.	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
1634	Nina	Cran	GB8	Archaeology (suggested field nearest to Hillside has possible value)	None stated.	As set out in the key requirements for the site in the draft DPD, the site features an Area of High Archaeological Potential in the north of the site. To ensure full information about heritage and archaeology informs its development, the developer will need to undertake an archaeological investigation and submit full details of this to the LPA in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1634	Nina	Cran	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
1634	Nina	Cran	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
1634	Nina	Cran	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise pollution on the environment and general amenity.	
1634	Nina	Cran	GB8	Increased Volume of Traffic would affect the environment	None stated.	The Council agrees that an increase in traffic can have a negative impact on the natural environment. One of the objectives of the Woking Core Strategy is to provide an integrated transport system that provide easy access to jobs, community facilities and green infrastructure by all modes, in particular sustainable modes of transport. The Site Allocations DPD proposes over 50 sites within the existing urban area that offer good accessibility to these services. The proposed sites in the Green Belt, including the safeguarded sites for development post 2027, are located adjacent to the existing urban areas where there is good access to services and facilities. The sites also offer the opportunity to improve foot and cycle paths to create a wider integrated network. It is considered by the Council that the sites identified for development are the most sustainable in terms of location and access to existing and proposed facilities. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out more information on this and is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1634	Nina	Cran	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 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1634	Nina	Cran	GB8	Loss of Green Fields 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 fields.</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 landscape 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 landscape 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 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
1634	Nina	Cran	GB8	Objecting to the release of Green Belt as it protects the countryside and wildlife, and is important to help keep the correct balance for 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1634	Nina	Cran	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
1634	Nina	Cran	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
1634	Nina	Cran	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. 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
1634	Nina	Cran	GB8	Woking and Mayford should not be merged	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB12	Proposed development is too large and would change the character of Pyrford. People do not want to live in big estates.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review.</p> <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 landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB13	Proposed development is too large and would change the character of Pyrford. People do not want to live in big estates.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy 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 landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB12	Will have a huge impact on development and should be reconsidered.	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
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB13	Will have a huge impact on development and should be reconsidered.	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
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB12	Smaller sites are available and although more work would provide housing. Gives the following three examples: Offices by the West Byfleet railway bridge: these have stood empty for years and now have fencing around them. Land which appears to be wasteland adjacent to the railway line just before West Byfleet station (travelling south). Unused retail units.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1046	Pam	Cranfield	GB13	Smaller sites are available and although more work would provide housing. Gives the following three examples: Offices by the West Byfleet railway bridge: these have stood empty for years and now have fencing around them. Land which appears to be wasteland adjacent to the railway line just before West Byfleet station (travelling south). Unused retail units.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
210	Arthur	Craven	General	Little notice has been taken of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan by Peter Brett Associates and Woking Borough Council. For example, in terms of urban sprawl, traffic density, local transport infrastructure, housing densities, etc. Motorists speed along Hook Heath's through routes and development on the escarpment would join Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan post dates the Green Belt boundary review and the Woking Core Strategy. It has been prepared to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy. Consequently, there should be no conflict between the two documents. The Core Strategy require the Council to identify Green Belt land to meet future housing needs. 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 Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the character of the area. The transport implications of the proposals has been 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
1316	Mark	Craven	GB1	Support the release of GB1 and GB3 from the GB. Recommend the sites come forward for 1-2 bedroom houses (including AH). Support sites coming forward prior to 2022, with appropriate modifications to Brookwood Crossroads.	None stated.	The support is noted. The proposed timescales reflect the Council's housing land supply situation within the Borough. This is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.  Proposals will be expected to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet local needs as evidenced in the SHMA, and also depending on the established local character and density. This is set out fully in Core Strategy policy CS11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1316	Mark	Craven	GB3	Support the release of GB1 and GB3 from the GB. Recommend the sites come forward for 1-2 bedroom houses (including AH). Support sites coming forward prior to 2022, with appropriate modifications to Brookwood Crossroads.	None stated.	The support is noted. The proposed timescales reflect the Council's housing land supply situation within the Borough. This is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.  Proposals will be expected to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet local needs as evidenced in the SHMA, and also depending on the established local character and density. This is set out fully in Core Strategy policy CS11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1316	Mark	Craven	GB2	Object to a further 8 pitches on the site. This appears to be contrary to government guidelines for a limit of 15 pitches in accordance to government guidelines	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. 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
1316	Mark	Craven	GB18	Support. Object to any lighting to be installed along new path connecting Basingstoke canal towpath and the site. This should be dark green space.	None stated.	The support is noted. Detailed design matters will be considered in preparing the SANG Proposals and Management Plan in consultation with Natural England and Surrey Wildlife Trust.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
538	Claire	Crawford	GB12	Objects to the proposals as local infrastructure will not cope with extra houses and cars, in terms of traffic on local road, school and local medical service capacity.	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 County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. 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
538	Claire	Crawford	GB13	Objects to the proposals as local infrastructure will not cope with extra houses and cars, in terms of traffic on local road, school and local medical service capacity.	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 County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. 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
538	Claire	Crawford	GB12	Attracted to Pyrford due to its semi-rural setting, and this is being taken away by the proposed development, which will change the village.	Reject the proposals.	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 1.0 and 2.0. The proposals can be developed without undermining the character and landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
538	Claire	Crawford	GB13	Attracted to Pyrford due to its semi-rural setting, and this is being taken away by the proposed development, which will change the village.	Reject the proposals.	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 1.0 and 2.0. The proposals can be developed without undermining the character and landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB12	I object. I cannot understand how the village will cope with the extra houses and cars. Traffic has already increased on local road. Lincoln Drive is used as a cut through and there have been accidents.	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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB13	I object. I cannot understand how the village will cope with the extra houses and cars. Traffic has already increased on local road. Lincoln Drive is used as a cut through and there have been accidents.	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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB12	Local doctors practice is very busy, virtually impossible to get an appointment in the week you call.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB13	Local doctors practice is very busy, virtually impossible to get an appointment in the week you call.	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	No further modification is 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 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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB12	Local school is full to capacity and could not accommodate one of my sons.	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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB13	Local school is full to capacity and could not accommodate one of my sons.	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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB12	We chose this semi rural setting, I feel this is being taken away by proposed development, changing the very being of the village. Urge you to reject these proposals.	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
1090	Philip	Crawford	GB13	We chose this semi rural setting, I feel this is being taken away by proposed development, changing the very being of the village. Urge you to reject these proposals.	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
453	Issy	Croft	General	It is unclear what this respondent is referring to in this very brief response.	None stated.	This comment is unclear. The assumption is that it could relate to either sites UA2, UA3 and UA4, or GB2, GB3 and GB4. Either way there are no specific details to provide a response on.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
81	Charles	Croker	GB12	The current local infrastructure in Pyrford and West Byfleet is insufficient to support additional capacity. Including  i] Medical facilities  [ii] Parking facilities  [iii] Schools  [iv] Employment opportunities  [v] Local amenities	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
81	Charles	Croker	GB12	Proposals would result in the loss of limited green space currently available	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.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including the sites in 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. Having said that the Council acknowledges the importance of every bit of Green Belt land to the community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
81	Charles	Croker	GB12	Proposals would affect the local character and result in the loss of 'village feel'	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	of this representation
81	Charles	Croker	GB13	The current local infrastructure in Pyrford and West Byfleet is insufficient to support additional capacity. Including  [i] Medical facilities  [ii] Parking facilities  [iii] Schools  [iv] Employment opportunities  [v] Local amenities	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
81	Charles	Croker	GB13	Proposals would result in the loss of limited green space currently available	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
81	Charles	Croker	GB13	Proposals would affect the local character and result in the loss of 'village feel'	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
308	Matthew	Cromey	GB15	Some of the GB in West Byfleet should be retained.	Withdraw the plan to release the green belt land at West Hall	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
308	Matthew	Cromey	GB16	Some of the GB in West Byfleet should be retained.	Withdraw the plan to release the green belt land at West Hall	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
308	Matthew	Cromey	GB15	The increase of traffic will be unsustainable	Remove the plan to change the status of green belt land at West Hall.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
308	Matthew	Cromey	GB15	Object to proposals at West Byfleet. The road will not cope with the additional traffic. Only one of the two developments should go ahead.	Withdraw the plan to release the green belt land at West Hall	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 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
308	Matthew	Cromey	GB16	Object to proposals at West Byfleet. The road will not cope with the additional traffic. Only one of the two developments should go ahead.	Withdraw the plan to release the green belt land at West Hall	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 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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.	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	GB9	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	GB14	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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). 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
						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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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). 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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). 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 also refer to 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		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). The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 road 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 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 road 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 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 road 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 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 road 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 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
1613	J.M.	Crosland	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 road 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 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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB8	Concerned that the proposals will lead to the loss of the rural/countryside feel.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB9	Concerned that the proposals will lead to the loss of the rural/countryside feel.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB10	Concerned that the proposals will lead to the loss of the rural/countryside feel.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB11	Concerned that the proposals will lead to the loss of the rural/countryside feel.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB14	Concerned that the proposals will lead to the loss of the rural/countryside feel.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB8	Concerned about the increase in traffic on local 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.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1223	Martin	Cross	GB9	Concerned about the increase in traffic on local 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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB10	Concerned about the increase in traffic on local 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 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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB11	Concerned about the increase in traffic on local 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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County	No further modification is 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 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>	
1223	Martin	Cross	GB14	Concerned about the increase in traffic on local 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. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. 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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB7	Mayford resident. Objects to GB7. Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here. A dispersed approach would be more appropriate	Consider a more dispersed approach to Traveller provision in the Borough	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB8	Acknowledges the difficult position the Council is in to meet future housing need, however concerned that the proposals will impact the identity of the historic village	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1223	Martin	Cross	GB9	Acknowledges the difficult position the Council is in to meet future housing need, however concerned that the proposals will impact the identity of the historic village	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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB10	Acknowledges the difficult position the Council is in to meet future housing need, however concerned that the proposals will impact the identity of the historic village	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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB11	Acknowledges the difficult position the Council is in to meet future housing need, however concerned that the proposals will impact the identity of the historic village	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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB14	Acknowledges the difficult position the Council is in to meet future housing need, however concerned that the proposals will impact the identity of the historic village	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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB8	<p>The purpose of the GB is listed in the GBBR. The proposed development would be contrary to the three of the main functions however the GBBR inconsistently dismisses the significance of the functions performed by the sites.</p> <p>There are mixed views about the proposals, some development would be welcomed but would wish to retain the semi-rural character of Mayford</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB9	<p>The purpose of the GB is listed in the GBBR. The proposed development would be contrary to the three of the main functions however the GBBR inconsistently dismisses the significance of the functions performed by the sites.</p> <p>There are mixed views about the proposals, some development would be welcomed but would wish to retain the semi-rural character of Mayford</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB10	<p>The purpose of the GB is listed in the GBBR. The proposed development would be contrary to the three of the main functions however the GBBR inconsistently dismisses the significance of the functions performed by the sites.</p> <p>There are mixed views about the proposals, some development would be welcomed but would wish to retain the semi-rural character of Mayford</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 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
1223	Martin	Cross	GB11	The purpose of the GB is listed in the GBBR. The proposed development would be contrary to the three of the main functions however the GBBR inconsistently dismisses the significance of the functions performed by the sites. There are mixed views about the proposals, some development would be welcomed but would wish to retain the semi-rural character of Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1223	Martin	Cross	GB14	The purpose of the GB is listed in the GBBR. The proposed development would be contrary to the three of the main functions however the GBBR inconsistently dismisses the significance of the functions performed by the sites.  There are mixed views about the proposals, some development would be welcomed but would wish to retain the semi-rural character of Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 10.0, paragraph 10.3, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	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	No further modification is 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>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>	
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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. 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB7	Object to 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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	<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. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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. 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB9	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. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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. 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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. 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting	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	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
				infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		<p>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>	of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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.	<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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1638	A.F.	Cross	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	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</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
				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.		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.	
1638	A.F.	Cross	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 road or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make	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
				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.		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.	
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 road 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 road 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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 road 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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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	No further modification is 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.	
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1638	A.F.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB9	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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	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	No further modification is 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.		protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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	No further modification is 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 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).	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1666	M.K.	Cross	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.	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 road 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 road or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make	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	No further modification is 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 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.		access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 road 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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 road 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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
1666	M.K.	Cross	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
46	A	Crouch	GB8	Strongly object to the release of GB for new homes  GB were created to keep a belt of land around urban areas green. The proposals will add to urban sprawl	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
46	A	Crouch	GB8	Proposals would "blot the landscape" and eradicate flora and fauna	None stated.	The Council carried out a landscape character assessment, and the DPD has been appropriately informed by landscape sensitivity assessment. This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Council is satisfied that the development of the sites will not compromise the landscape character and setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB8	The local area cannot sustain the increase demand on its infrastructure created by the proposals	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
46	A	Crouch	GB8	There will be a wider impact on infrastructure-anyone who lives locally and uses the road, other transport systems, medical services, schools etc. will be impacted	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 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 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
46	A	Crouch	GB8	Travelling between Guildford and Woking is already difficult, with congestion on the A320 to Turnoak Roundabout.  The impact of proposals may deter people from setting up offices, employment premises a retail in the Borough	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB8	The proposals are too large for the area to cope with	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. They are necessary to contribute towards meeting the development needs of the area. The Council will ensure that they are supported by adequate infrastructure to make the development sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB9	Strongly object to the release of GB for new homes  GB were created to keep a belt of land around urban areas green. The proposals will add to urban sprawl	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
46	A	Crouch	GB9	Proposals would "blot the landscape" and eradicate flora and fauna	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB9	The local area cannot sustain the increase demand on its infrastructure created by the proposals	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
46	A	Crouch	GB9	There will be a wider impact on infrastructure-anyone who lives locally and uses the road, other transport systems, medical services, schools etc. will be impacted	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 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
46	A	Crouch	GB9	Travelling between Guildford and Woking is already difficult, with congestion on the A320 to Turnoak Roundabout.  The impact of proposals may deter people from setting up offices, employment premises a retail in the Borough	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB9	The proposals are too large for the area to cope with	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. They are necessary to contribute towards meeting the development needs of the area. The Council will ensure that they are supported by adequate infrastructure to make the development sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB10	Strongly object to the release of GB for new homes  GB were created to keep a belt of land around urban areas green. The proposals will add to urban sprawl	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
46	A	Crouch	GB10	Proposals would "blot the landscape" and eradicate flora and fauna	None stated.	The landscape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB10	The local area cannot sustain the increase demand on its infrastructure created by the proposals	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
46	A	Crouch	GB10	There will be a wider impact on infrastructure-anyone who lives locally and uses the road, other transport systems, medical services, schools etc. will be impacted	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 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
46	A	Crouch	GB10	Travelling between Guildford and Woking is already difficult, with congestion on the A320 to Turnoak Roundabout.  The impact of proposals may deter people from setting up offices, employment premises a retail in the Borough	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB10	The proposals are too large for the area to cope with	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. They are necessary to contribute towards meeting the development needs of the area. The Council will ensure that they are supported by adequate infrastructure to make the development sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB11	Strongly object to the release of GB for new homes  GB were created to keep a belt of land around urban areas green. The proposals will add to urban sprawl	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB11	Proposals would "blot the landscape" and eradicate flora and fauna	None stated.	The landscape 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
46	A	Crouch	GB11	The local area cannot sustain the increase demand on its infrastructure created by the proposals	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
46	A	Crouch	GB11	There will be a wider impact on infrastructure-anyone who lives locally and uses the road, other transport systems, medical services, schools etc. will be impacted	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 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
46	A	Crouch	GB11	Travelling between Guildford and Woking is already difficult, with congestion on the A320 to Turnoak Roundabout. The impact of proposals may deter people from setting up offices, employment premises a retail in the Borough	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
46	A	Crouch	GB11	The proposals are too large for the area to cope with	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. They are necessary to contribute towards meeting the development needs of the area. The Council will ensure that they are supported by adequate infrastructure to make the development sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
67	C	Crouch	GB8	Strongly object to the proposal to build new homes and to develop on land that is Green Belt. Green Belt was created to do just what it says - keep development off the areas which are included under its umbrella. This policy should be respected and not just discarded when it suits WBC, especially when its against the wishes of many residents.	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
67	C	Crouch	GB8	As well as wildlife disappearing and much needed open space for the those who live in this busy part of the country, of huge relevance is that the area cannot sustain the increase demand all this development will place on it. Anyone (not just those that live in Mayford) who uses the road, medical services, schools etc. in the area will suffer.	None stated.	The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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. 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
67	C	Crouch	GB8	The Egley Road is already nose to tail crawling much of the time - how can WBC expect it to cope with more. It can't !!	None stated.	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
67	C	Crouch	GB8	The local services are already stretched - how are they to cope with more. They can't!!	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development 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
67	C	Crouch	GB9	Strongly object to the proposal to build new homes and to develop on land that is Green Belt. Green Belt was created to do just what it says - keep development off the areas which are included under its umbrella. This policy should be respected and not just discarded when it suits WBC, especially when its against the wishes of many residents.	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
67	C	Crouch	GB9	As well as wildlife disappearing and much needed open space for the those who live in this busy part of the country, of huge relevance is that the area cannot sustain the increase demand all this development will place on it. Anyone (not just those that live in Mayford) who uses the road, medical services, schools etc. in the area will suffer.	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
67	C	Crouch	GB9	The Egley Road is already nose to tail crawling much of the time - how can WBC expect it to cope with more. It can't !!	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
67	C	Crouch	GB9	The local services are already stretched - how are they to cope with more. They can't!!	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development 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
67	C	Crouch	GB10	Strongly object to the proposal to build new homes and to develop on land that is Green Belt. Green Belt was created to do just what it says - keep development off the areas which are included under its umbrella. This policy should be respected and not just discarded when it suits WBC, especially when its against the wishes of many residents.	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
67	C	Crouch	GB10	As well as wildlife disappearing and much needed open space for the those who live in this busy part of the country, of huge relevance is that the area cannot sustain the increase demand all this development will place on it. Anyone (not just those that live in Mayford) who uses the road, medical services, schools etc. in the area will suffer.	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 infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals are 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
67	C	Crouch	GB10	The Egley Road is already nose to tail crawling much of the time - how can WBC expect it to cope with more. It can't !!	None stated.	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
67	C	Crouch	GB10	The local services are already stretched - how are they to cope with more. They can't!!	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development 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
67	C	Crouch	GB11	Strongly object to the proposal to build new homes and to develop on land that is Green Belt. Green Belt was created to do just what it says - keep development off the areas which are included under its umbrella. This policy should be respected and not just discarded when it suits WBC, especially when its against the wishes of many residents.	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. Whilst the Council has carefully considered the views expressed by local residents, it needs to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the community as agreed in the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
67	C	Crouch	GB11	As well as wildlife disappearing and much needed open space for the those who live in this busy part of the country, of huge relevance is that the area cannot sustain the increase demand all this development will place on it. Anyone (not just those that live in Mayford) who uses the road, medical services, schools etc. in the area will suffer.	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. The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals are 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
67	C	Crouch	GB11	The Egley Road is already nose to tail crawling much of the time - how can WBC expect it to cope with more. It can't !!	None stated.	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
67	C	Crouch	GB11	The local services are already stretched - how are they to cope with more. They can't!!	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development 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
815	Andy	Crouch	GB8	Objects to development on the proposed sites. The proposals go against the purpose of Green Belt to keep open spaces between towns and villages and prevent urban sprawl. Understand that Woking may need to consider Green Belt land for development in the future but the current government do not support this. As stated by Sajid Javid MP. The proposals exceed the minimum required for Green Belt land and WBC has not made the full case to release the land in the south of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB9	Objects to development on the proposed sites. The proposals go against the purpose of Green Belt to keep open spaces between towns and villages and prevent urban	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0	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
				sprawl. Understand that Woking may need to consider Green Belt land for development in the future but the current government do not support this. As stated by Sajid Javid MP. The proposals exceed the minimum required for Green Belt land and WBC has not made the full case to release the land in the south of Woking.			
815	Andy	Crouch	GB10	Objects to development on the proposed sites. The proposals go against the purpose of Green Belt to keep open spaces between towns and villages and prevent urban sprawl. Understand that Woking may need to consider Green Belt land for development in the future but the current government do not support this. As stated by Sajid Javid MP. The proposals exceed the minimum required for Green Belt land and WBC has not made the full case to release the land in the south of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB11	Objects to development on the proposed sites. The proposals go against the purpose of Green Belt to keep open spaces between towns and villages and prevent urban sprawl. Understand that Woking may need to consider Green Belt land for development in the future but the current government do not support this. As stated by Sajid Javid MP. The proposals exceed the minimum required for Green Belt land and WBC has not made the full case to release the land in the south of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB14	Objects to development on the proposed sites. The proposals go against the purpose of Green Belt to keep open spaces between towns and villages and prevent urban sprawl. Understand that Woking may need to consider Green Belt land for development in the future but the current government do not support this. As stated by Sajid Javid MP. The proposals exceed the minimum required for Green Belt land and WBC has not made the full case to release the land in the south of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB8	The biggest impact of the proposals will be on local transport infrastructure. Egley Road is already congested and additional development will make matter worse. The need for a retail park does not make sense and additional retail provision will add to congestion and traffic. There is no sound basis for this. The existing trains are full to capacity and more commuters will make it worse, including on the road as people will drive to the station.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, 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 will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</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 Council, as noted in the key requirements for the proposed sites, will seek to improve pedestrian and cycle access across the Borough as well as public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car into Woking and the Borough's railway stations. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS16 and CS18.</p>	
815	Andy	Crouch	GB9	The proposals will have the biggest impact on local transport infrastructure. Egley Road is already congested and getting worse. Additional developments in the wider area will increase congestion. The need for a retail park in Woking does not make sense as it will create a destination specific shopping outlet that will add to traffic and congestion. This has no sound basis. The existing train network is at capacity and more development will have a negative impact on the network. Additional housing will also place added car parking and traffic issues in Woking Town Centre.	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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, 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 will not have a significant impact on the highways network. 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 Council, as noted in the key requirements for the proposed sites, will seek to improve pedestrian and cycle access across the Borough as well as public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car into Woking and the Borough's railway stations. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS16 and CS18.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB10	The proposals will have the biggest impact on local transport infrastructure. Egley Road is already congested and getting worse. Additional developments in the wider area will	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</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
				increase congestion. The need for a retail park in Woking does not make sense as it will create a destination specific shopping outlet that will add to traffic and congestion. This has no sound basis. The existing train network is at capacity and more development will have a negative impact on the network. Additional housing will also place added car parking and traffic issues in Woking Town Centre.		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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, 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 will not have a significant impact on the highways network. 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 to inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Council, as noted in the key requirements for the proposed sites, will seek to improve pedestrian and cycle access across the Borough as well as public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car into Woking and the Borough's railway stations. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS16 and CS18.	
815	Andy	Crouch	GB11	The proposals will have the biggest impact on local transport infrastructure. Egley Road is already congested and getting worse. Additional developments in the wider area will increase congestion. The need for a retail park in Woking does not make sense as it will create a destination specific shopping outlet that will add to traffic and congestion. This has no sound basis. The existing train network is at capacity and more development will have a negative impact on the network. Additional housing will also place added car parking and traffic issues in Woking Town Centre.	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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity	No further modification is 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 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 will not have a significant impact on the highways network. 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 Council, as noted in the key requirements for the proposed sites, will seek to improve pedestrian and cycle access across the Borough as well as public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car into Woking and the Borough's railway stations. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS16 and CS18.	
815	Andy	Crouch	GB14	The proposals will have the biggest impact on local transport infrastructure. Egley Road is already congested and getting worse. Additional developments in the wider area will increase congestion. The need for a retail park in Woking does not make sense as it will create a destination specific shopping outlet that will add to traffic and congestion. This has no sound basis. The existing train network is at capacity and more development will have a negative impact on the network. Additional housing will also place added car parking and traffic issues in Woking Town Centre.	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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, 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 will not have a significant impact on the highways network. 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 Council, as noted in the key requirements for the proposed sites, will seek to improve pedestrian and cycle access across the Borough as well as public transport, to reduce the need to travel by car into Woking and the Borough's railway stations. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS16 and CS18.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
815	Andy	Crouch	GB8	Major developments taking place in the wider area will add to the impact of development in Woking. These large scale developments should not be planned in isolation.	None stated.	The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
815	Andy	Crouch	GB9	Major developments taking place in the wider area will add to the impact of development in Woking. These large scale developments should not be planned in isolation.	None stated.	The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
815	Andy	Crouch	GB10	Major developments taking place in the wider area will add to the impact of development in Woking. These large scale developments should not be planned in isolation.	None stated.	The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
815	Andy	Crouch	GB11	Major developments taking place in the wider area will add to the impact of development in Woking. These large scale developments should not be planned in isolation.	None stated.	The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
815	Andy	Crouch	GB14	Major developments taking place in the wider area will add to the impact of development in Woking. These large scale developments should not be planned in isolation.	None stated.	The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB12	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB13	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB15	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB16	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	
198	J	Crowle	GB4	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB5	Local road will be unable to cope with the extra traffic from 1,385 dwellings and 3,000 cars. Parvis Road, Camphill Road, Pyrford Common Road and Old Woking Road already overloaded. Roads are dangerous to cross.	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 implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 20 and 3. Furthermore, the Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby authorities. More importantly, each of 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 with the County Council to address the transport implications of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB16	The Marist Convent and West Byfleet schools already cause absolute chaos at certain times, the prospect of another one (at Broad oaks) does not bear thinking about.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, 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
198	J	Crowle	GB12	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
198	J	Crowle	GB13	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	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
198	J	Crowle	GB15	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	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
198	J	Crowle	GB16	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
198	J	Crowle	GB4	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	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
198	J	Crowle	GB5	I am against this proposal, loss of Green Belt will completely spoil the environment of our villages.	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
198	J	Crowle	GB12	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB13	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB15	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB16	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB4	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
198	J	Crowle	GB5	Doctors' surgeries are already over-subscribed, long waits for appointments. Another health centre would be needed. I hope that this proposal will be dropped.	None stated.	The infrastructure needs to support to support the proposed development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. 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
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	There are inconsistencies in the assessment in relation to car usage.	None stated.	The sustainability objectives cover various aspect and the Council is confident that these have been consistently assessed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	The removal of the athletics track and reduction in green space is contrary to the objective of facilitating improved health and well being.	None stated.	The site allocation meets policy Core Strategy CS5 Priority Places which seeks to take proactive approach to make positive changes in these areas. The site is proposed for the redevelopment for housing, retail, open space, leisure and recreational facilities.  An explanation has been provided in the 'comments' column for the assessment that fully explains the scoring. The scoring has taken into account the loss of the athletics track in the short term with a negative score. However, it notes that reprovision of the facility in the longer term will address this.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	Proposals will lead to an increase in hard landscaping and will increase surface water runoff/flooding. The area is already at risk of flooding. The proposals will exacerbate problems.	None stated.	Whilst flooding 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
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	The walking time to Woking station are not accurate.	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
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	The development of wholesale demolition Sheerwater is inconsistent with the objective of re-using existing buildings.	None stated.	The 'comments' column for the SA clearly explains that the site is a mix of brownfield and greenfield land. Overall, development would support the use of previously developed land in the existing urban area and support higher density mixed use developments. The proposed development would make the best use of previously developed land, support a higher density of development and a mix of uses as encouraged in the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	Proposals can only result in an increase in air, light and noise pollution- as demonstrated by the ASDA scheme.	None stated.	Proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies and relevant guidance. Including Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, emerging Development Management Policies, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. These include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites avoid significant harmful impact in terms of amenity and pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1268	John	Crowley	UA32	Inconsistencies in how the impact crime is measured.	None stated.	Assessments require a balanced judgement to be made based on the available evidence. The Council can ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any development is minimised through careful design. Therefore a neutral score has been attributed to the proposal with regards to this. This is consistent approach throughout the SA.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB10	Object to proposals in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14. The proposals disregard policy CS24 which seeks the conservation and enhancement of the local landscape and townscape character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB11	Object to proposals in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14. The proposals disregard policy CS24 which seeks the conservation and enhancement of the local landscape and townscape character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB14	Object to proposals in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14. The proposals disregard policy CS24 which seeks the conservation and enhancement of the local landscape and townscape character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB10	Travel times are based on google- this is inaccurate as there is no consideration for peak period.	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
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB11	Travel times are based on google- this is inaccurate as there is no consideration for peak period.	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
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB14	Travel times are based on google- this is inaccurate as there is no consideration for peak period.	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
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB10	Objects on the ground that there have been no consultation on the GBBR. Sites are recommended due to their proximity to a Local Centre. There is a Post Office and barbers, no other supporting infrastructure	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
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB11	Objects on the ground that there have been no consultation on the GBBR. Sites are recommended due to their proximity to a Local Centre. There is a Post Office and barbers, no other supporting infrastructure	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
376	Patricia	Cryer	GB14	Objects on the ground that there have been no consultation on the GBBR. Sites are recommended due to their proximity to a Local Centre. There is a Post Office and barbers, no other supporting infrastructure	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
402	Neill	Cryer	GB11	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. This goes beyond the remit of the Core Strategy 2027	None stated.	Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
402	Neill	Cryer	GB10	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. This goes beyond the remit of the Core Strategy 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
402	Neill	Cryer	GB10	A main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl. The current proposals would create continuous urban sprawl through building on open land between Hook Heath and Mayford	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
402	Neill	Cryer	GB11	A main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl. The current proposals would create continuous 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				through building on open land between Hook Heath and Mayford			of this representation
402	Neill	Cryer	GB10	No consideration has been given to WBC's own Core Strategy, where policy CS24 requires that all development provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, particularly key landscapes and features. The proposals do not take these into consideration	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
402	Neill	Cryer	GB11	No consideration has been given to WBC's own Core Strategy, where policy CS24 requires that all development provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, particularly key landscapes and features. The proposals do not take these into consideration	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0.  Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
402	Neill	Cryer	GB10	Object to proposals GB10 and GB11. There are major flaws in the GBBR which informs the Site Allocation DPD. Including: - it was not conducted openly or in a transparent manner- there was no public consultation -The assessment has not taken into consideration a detailed landscape character assessment for the area but relied on a strategic overview based on subjective opinion. The assessment should carry no material weight whatsoever.	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
402	Neill	Cryer	GB11	Object to proposals GB10 and GB11. There are major flaws in the GBBR which informs the Site Allocation DPD. Including: - it was not conducted openly or in a transparent manner- there was no public consultation -The assessment has not taken into consideration a detailed landscape character assessment for the area but relied on a strategic overview based on subjective opinion. The assessment should carry no material weight whatsoever.	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
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB4	Concerned at Byfleet's shrinking Green Belt, which is tiny compared to other parts of Woking such as Mayford and Pyrford etc.	None stated.	This representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB5	Concerned at Byfleet's shrinking Green Belt, which is tiny compared to other parts of Woking such as Mayford and Pyrford etc.	None stated.	This representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. 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	No further modification is 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 development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB4	Health facilities in Byfleet do not exist, we are expected to queue in traffic on the A245.	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 is also addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB5	Health facilities in Byfleet do not exist, we are expected to queue in traffic on the A245.	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 is also addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB4	Appalled that WBC has not publicised the proposals. No one would know about the proposals if it weren't for Facebook.	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
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB5	Appalled that WBC has not publicised the proposals. No one would know about the proposals if it weren't for Facebook.	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
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB4	Can't believe the Council would consider further building along the A245, as it is already at a standstill at peak hours. The village is used as a 'rat run'.	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
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB5	Can't believe the Council would consider further building along the A245, as it is already at a standstill at peak hours. The village is used as a 'rat run'.	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
1423	Julia	Cryer	GB5	This land is usually flooded annually, and having been a victim of flooding any further building would increase the risk of it re-occurring,	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB4	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB5	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB12	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB13	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB15	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB16	The local drainage system is inadequate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to road see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With respect to drainage systems see Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB4	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are affected when there are problems 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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB5	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are affected when there are problems 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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB12	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				affected when there are problems on the M25			of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB13	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are affected when there are problems 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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB15	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are affected when there are problems 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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB16	Object to GB release. Local road are inadequate. Parvis Road and Byfleet Road are already congested and are affected when there are problems 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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB4	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB5	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB12	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB13	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB15	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB16	Local facilities are oversubscribed (including schools, medical centre and hospital) and can not cope with the increase	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
362	Janet	Crysell	GB4	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB5	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB12	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB13	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB15	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB16	Concerned that the Byfleet petition 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 Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB4	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB5	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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</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
						is therefore relatively modest.	
362	Janet	Crysell	GB12	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB13	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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
362	Janet	Crysell	GB15	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
362	Janet	Crysell	GB16	Proposals are disproportionate. Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	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</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 needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
1569	Peter, Ann	Cuddon	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There are also concerns regarding wildlife, pollution and disruption due to traffic. Hope that the proposal does not 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. 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. 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 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. It is envisaged that planning to meet future 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1569	Peter, Ann	Cuddon	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There are also concerns regarding wildlife, pollution and disruption due to traffic. Hope that the proposal does not 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. 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</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>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. 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 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. It is envisaged that planning to meet future 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.</p>	
754	Michael	Cuell	GB12	Schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	Scrap the plans altogether. Or consider relocating to land adjacent to the A3.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modification to locate development close to the A3. The A3 lies within Guildford Borough. Whilst the A3 is close to the Borough Boundary near to Sutton Green, this area of the Borough is not suitable for residential development as it is within a functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3). In addition, residential development based entirely on access to the A3 is not sustainable as there is no easy pedestrian or cycle access to local services, community facilities or public transport.</p> <p>The Core Strategy facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period for Woking Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy to meet local housing needs. Based on the above, the proposed modification to locate development to land adjacent to the A3 is not suitable, sustainable or achievable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
754	Michael	Cuell	GB13	Schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	Scrap the plans altogether. Or	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Council note the proposed modification to locate development close to the A3. The A3 lies within Guildford Borough. Whilst the A3 is close to the Borough Boundary near 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
					consider relocating toland adjacent to the A3.	Sutton Green, this area of the Borough is not suitable for residential development as it is within a functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3). In addition, residential development based entirely on access to the A3 is not sustainable as there is no easy pedestrian or cycle access to local services, community facilities or public transport. The Core Strategy facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period for Woking Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy to meet local housing needs. Based on the above, the proposed modification to locate development to land adjacent to the A3 is not suitable, sustainable or achievable.	
754	Michael	Cuell	GB12	The proposals will ruin the area. Green Belt will be infringed, traffic will be gridlocked and air pollution will increase.	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 development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</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
754	Michael	Cuell	GB13	The proposals will ruin the area. Green Belt will be infringed, traffic will be gridlocked and air pollution will increase.	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</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 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 development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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.	
662	John	Curd	Cumulative impacts	No thorough consultation has been made on infrastructure.	A thorough consultation on current and required infrastructure. A thorough consultation on brownfield sites by an external professional.	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
662	John	Curd	GB5	Green Belt was introduced for good reason and no evidence to show that this should change. A proper independent survey should be carried out on brownfield land before considering changing the Green Belt.	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
662	John	Curd	GB4	Green Belt was introduced for good reason and no evidence to show that this should change. A proper independent survey should be carried out on brownfield land before considering changing the Green Belt.	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
662	John	Curd	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external professional body before any thought of building new homes.	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 Council is satisfied that the depth and breadth of evidence gathered to supported the DPD is sufficiently comprehensive, adequate, sufficient and robust enough to inform planning judgments about the preferred sites in the DPD. This includes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which provides an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. In addition to the IDP, the Council has worked it partners to publish specific strategies and programmes to provide further details on how some of the infrastructure will be delivered. This is set out within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
662	John	Curd	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external	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 Council is satisfied that the depth and breadth of evidence gathered to supported the DPD is sufficiently comprehensive, adequate, sufficient and robust enough to inform planning judgments about the preferred sites in the DPD. This includes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which provides an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. In addition to the IDP, the Council has worked it partners to publish specific strategies and programmes to provide further details on how some of the infrastructure will be delivered. This is set out within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
					professional body before any thought of building new homes.	3.0.	
662	John	Curd	GB4	No infrastructure considerations taken place. The road are already congested and would not be able to support additional development.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external professional body before any thought of building new homes.	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 other forms of infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council's IDP sets out the infrastructure requirements for the Borough to support development. The IDP is updated on a regular basis and heavily informed by the relevant infrastructure providers in the Borough. The Council is fully committed to working with the infrastructure providers in order to ensure that provision meets demand on the back of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
662	John	Curd	GB5	No infrastructure considerations taken place. The road are already congested and would not be able to support additional development.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external professional body before any thought of building new homes.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  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 considers that the existing evidence based documents set out in Section 3.0 of the Matters and Issues Topic Paper are robust and up to date. As stated above, the Council is committed to working it the County Council and all other infrastructure providers to make sure that demand keeps up with development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
662	John	Curd	GB5	Schools are at capacity and would not be able to support further population increases.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, includingschoo	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Is, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external professional body before any thought of building new homes.		
662	John	Curd	GB4	Schools are at capacity and would not be able to support further population increases.	A serious review of the local infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and most importantly road should be carried out by an external professional body before any thought of building new homes.	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
662	John	Curd	Appendix Air Quality Modelling	Development would have an impact on air quality.	Do not approve the developments.	The proposed allocated sites are generally in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and have the 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 sites which state that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
662	John	Curd	General	Need an external professional report on brownfield sites within Woking. Also need a transparent review of the local infrastructure.	None 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 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
337	Carol	Curr	GB4	The proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet (residential and school) will cause chaos on the road, particularly Parvis Road. There is congestion in all directions (i.e. to and from Cobham and A3, Weybridge, New Haw and Addlestone, West Byfleet) at peak hours. The suggestion of widening the Byfleet/New Haw railway bridge is not likely to relieve traffic. In any event, this should have been considered in advance.	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 road. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						proposals 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.	
337	Carol	Curr	GB5	The proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet (residential and school) will cause chaos on the road, particularly Parvis Road. There is congestion in all directions (i.e. to and from Cobham and A3, Weybridge, New Haw and Addlestone, West Byfleet) at peak hours. The suggestion of widening the Byfleet/New Haw railway bridge is not likely to relieve traffic. In any event, this should have been considered in advance.	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 road. 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB15	The proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet (residential and school) will cause chaos on the road, particularly Parvis Road. There is congestion in all directions (i.e. to and from Cobham and A3, Weybridge, New Haw and Addlestone, West Byfleet) at peak hours. The suggestion of widening the Byfleet/New Haw railway bridge is not likely to relieve traffic. In any event, this should have been considered in advance.	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
337	Carol	Curr	GB16	The proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet (residential and school) will cause chaos on the road, particularly Parvis Road. There is congestion in all directions (i.e. to and from Cobham and A3, Weybridge, New Haw and Addlestone, West Byfleet) at peak hours. The suggestion of widening the Byfleet/New Haw railway bridge is not likely to relieve traffic. In any event, this should have been considered in advance.	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
337	Carol	Curr	GB4	Byfleet has and often floods. Examples include Brooklands park, Tescos and Weymede.	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB5	Byfleet has and often floods. Examples include Brooklands park, Tescos and Weymede.	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB15	Byfleet has and often floods. Examples include Brooklands park, Tescos and Weymede.	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB16	Byfleet has and often floods. Examples include Brooklands park, Tescos and Weymede.	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in Byfleet 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB4	Infrastructure including local road, services and utilities are inadequate to accommodate the proposed development	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
337	Carol	Curr	GB5	Infrastructure including local road, services and utilities are inadequate to accommodate the proposed development	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
337	Carol	Curr	GB15	Infrastructure including local road, services and utilities are inadequate to accommodate the proposed development	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
337	Carol	Curr	GB16	Infrastructure including local road, services and utilities are inadequate to accommodate the proposed development	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
337	Carol	Curr	GB4	Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like this to be 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB5	Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like this to be 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB15	Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like this to be 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
337	Carol	Curr	GB16	Concerned that a petition submitted to WBC on GB release has been ignored. Would like this to be 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB4	Understand the need for housing but believes that Byfleet should not be considered further as there is other land available and it would result of Byfleet losing most of its local GB.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0</p> <p>In 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 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
337	Carol	Curr	GB5	Understand the need for housing but believes that Byfleet should not be considered further as there is other land available and it would result of Byfleet losing most of its local GB.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 In 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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
337	Carol	Curr	GB15	Understand the need for housing but believes that Byfleet should not be considered further as there is other land available and it would result of Byfleet losing most of its local GB.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0</p> <p>In 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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
337	Carol	Curr	GB16	Understand the need for housing but believes that Byfleet should not be considered further as there is other land available and it would result of Byfleet losing most of its local GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 In 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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	Requests that each point raised is responded to and requests are fulfilled. The proposals will have an irreversible impact on Mayford and has been shown to be completely unjustified.	None stated.	Each point of this, and all, representations are dually responded to. This part of the 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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	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
563	Simon	Curry	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. The cost of upgrading the transport system to support the increased population is not considered in a site's viability and is a significant flaw in the ranking [in the Green Belt Review].	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 point about the costs of upgrading the transport system, and its consideration with regard to site viability is covered in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 10.0. The point about public transport 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. The cost of upgrading the transport system to support the increased population is not considered in a site's viability and is a significant flaw in the ranking [in the Green Belt Review].	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 point about the costs of upgrading the transport system, and its consideration with regard to site viability is covered in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 10.0. The point about public transport 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. The cost of upgrading the transport system to support the increased population is not considered in a site's viability and is a significant flaw in the ranking [in the Green Belt Review].	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 point about the costs of upgrading the transport system, and its consideration with regard to site viability is covered in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 10.0. The point about public transport 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. The cost of upgrading the transport system to support the increased population is not considered in a site's viability and is a significant flaw in the ranking [in the Green Belt Review].	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 point about the costs of upgrading the transport system, and its consideration with regard to site viability is covered in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 10.0. The point about public transport 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. The cost of upgrading the transport system to support the increased population is not considered in a site's viability and is a significant flaw in the ranking [in the Green Belt Review].	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 point about the costs of upgrading the transport system, and its consideration with regard to site viability is covered in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 10.0. The point about public transport 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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The Council has not considered the additional traffic resulting from new development at Kingmoor Park, Willow Reach, Slyfield Industrial Estate and potential re-location of Guildford Football Club on Salt Box Road.	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, and Section 24.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The Council has not considered the additional traffic resulting from new development at Kingmoor Park, Willow Reach, Slyfield Industrial Estate and potential re-location of Guildford	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, and Section 24.0.</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
				Football Club on Salt Box Road.			
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The Council has not considered the additional traffic resulting from new development at Kingmoor Park, Willow Reach, Slyfield Industrial Estate and potential re-location of Guildford Football Club on Salt Box Road.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The Council has not considered the additional traffic resulting from new development at Kingmoor Park, Willow Reach, Slyfield Industrial Estate and potential re-location of Guildford Football Club on Salt Box Road.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The Council has not considered the additional traffic resulting from new development at Kingmoor Park, Willow Reach, Slyfield Industrial Estate and potential re-location of Guildford Football Club on Salt Box Road.	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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None 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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and	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	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
				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.		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.	of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	The DPD states that current and historical contaminative uses may have led to soil and groundwater contaminations, and that this will need to be properly considered and investigated. States the expanded Traveller site is unacceptable on contaminated land and only where land has been decontaminated should development be considered.	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 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, paragraph 4.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	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 such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.		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.	
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability of each relevant factor appears subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore arbitrary. E.g. the Green Belt review identifies areas of land not to be considered due to constraints, however it then proceeds to recommend land that contains these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Peter Brett report is based on a robust methodology that is consistently applied. The conclusions follow the data analysis. Some of the information such as the landscape sensitivity of developing the sites are based mainly on primary data. For such a complex study, it is reasonable to expect that some professional judgments would have to be made, and where that has been the case, it is done in a transparent manner. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability of each relevant factor appears subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore arbitrary. E.g. the Green Belt review identifies areas of land not to be considered due to constraints, however it then proceeds to recommend land that contains these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Peter Brett report is based on a robust methodology that is consistently applied. The conclusions follow the data analysis. Some of the information such as the landscape sensitivity of developing the sites are based mainly on primary data. For such a complex study, it is reasonable to expect that some professional judgments would have to be made, and where that has been the case, it is done in a transparent manner. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability of each relevant factor appears subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore arbitrary. E.g. the Green Belt review identifies areas of land not to be considered due to constraints, however it then proceeds to recommend land that contains these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Peter Brett report is based on a robust methodology that is consistently applied. The conclusions follow the data analysis. Some of the information such as the landscape sensitivity of developing the sites are based mainly on primary data. For such a complex study, it is reasonable to expect that some professional judgments would have to be made, and where that has been the case, it is done in a transparent manner. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability of each relevant factor appears subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore arbitrary. E.g. the Green Belt review identifies areas of land not to be considered due to constraints, however it then proceeds to recommend land that contains these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Peter Brett report is based on a robust methodology that is consistently applied. The conclusions follow the data analysis. Some of the information such as the landscape sensitivity of developing the sites are based mainly on primary data. For such a complex study, it is reasonable to expect that some professional judgments would have to be made, and where that has been the case, it is done in a transparent manner. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability of each relevant factor appears subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore arbitrary. E.g. the Green Belt review identifies areas of land not to be considered due to constraints, however it then proceeds to recommend land that contains these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Peter Brett report is based on a robust methodology that is consistently applied. The conclusions follow the data analysis. Some of the information such as the landscape sensitivity of developing the sites are based mainly on primary data. For such a complex study, it is reasonable to expect that some professional judgments would have to be made, and where that has been the case, it is done in a transparent manner. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The second reason [for believing the Council has not exhausted all brownfield sites for development] is that the DPD covers land to be developed to 2027 and safeguarded sites for development from 2027-40. However, only brownfield land available for development now is considered. The natural lifecycle of land i.e. aged developments requiring regeneration and commercial development changing use means there will be future supply to meet future demand. No analysis has been undertaken to evaluate aged or ageing	None stated.	Point noted, however it is unlikely that the supply of land from urban sites in 12-25 years would be sufficient to meet housing need during that period. It is insufficient to meet the requirement in the current plan period, to 2027. Sections 1.0 and 2.0, and 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper provide further detail.	No further modification is 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 could become available in 12-25 years time.			
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The second reason [for believing the Council has not exhausted all brownfield sites for development] is that the DPD covers land to be developed to 2027 and safeguarded sites for development from 2027-40. However, only brownfield land available for development now is considered. The natural lifecycle of land i.e. aged developments requiring regeneration and commercial development changing use means there will be future supply to meet future demand. No analysis has been undertaken to evaluate aged or ageing development that could become available in 12-25 years time.	None stated.	Point noted, however it is unlikely that the supply of land from urban sites in 12-25 years would be sufficient to meet housing need during that period. It is insufficient to meet the requirement in the current plan period, to 2027. Sections 1.0 and 2.0, and 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper provide further detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The second reason [for believing the Council has not exhausted all brownfield sites for development] is that the DPD covers land to be developed to 2027 and safeguarded sites for development from 2027-40. However, only brownfield land available for development now is considered. The natural lifecycle of land i.e. aged developments requiring regeneration and commercial development changing use means there will be future supply to meet future demand. No analysis has been undertaken to evaluate aged or ageing development that could become available in 12-25 years time.	None stated.	Point noted, however it is unlikely that the supply of land from urban sites in 12-25 years would be sufficient to meet housing need during that period. It is insufficient to meet the requirement in the current plan period, to 2027. Sections 1.0 and 2.0, and 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper provide further detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The second reason [for believing the Council has not exhausted all brownfield sites for development] is that the DPD covers land to be developed to 2027 and safeguarded sites for development from 2027-40. However, only brownfield land available for development now is considered. The natural lifecycle of land i.e. aged developments requiring regeneration and commercial development changing use means there will be future supply to meet future demand. No analysis has been undertaken to evaluate aged or ageing development that could become available in 12-25 years time.	None stated.	Point noted, however it is unlikely that the supply of land from urban sites in 12-25 years would be sufficient to meet housing need during that period. It is insufficient to meet the requirement in the current plan period, to 2027. Sections 1.0 and 2.0, and 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper provide further detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The second reason [for believing the Council has not exhausted all brownfield sites for development] is that the DPD covers land to be developed to 2027 and safeguarded sites for development from 2027-40. However, only brownfield land available for development now is considered. The natural lifecycle of land i.e. aged developments requiring regeneration and commercial development changing use means there will be future supply to meet future demand. No analysis has been undertaken to evaluate aged or ageing development that could become available in 12-25 years time.	None stated.	Point noted, however it is unlikely that the supply of land from urban sites in 12-25 years would be sufficient to meet housing need during that period. It is insufficient to meet the requirement in the current plan period, to 2027. Sections 1.0 and 2.0, and 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper provide further detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	The Council is acting contrary to the SHLAA 2014 by allocating the site as an extended traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The report incorrectly dismisses the Green Belt purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character". However, Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Domesday Book.		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.	
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The report incorrectly dismisses the Green Belt purpose To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character". 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The report incorrectly dismisses the Green Belt purpose To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character". 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The report incorrectly dismisses the Green Belt purpose To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character". 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The report incorrectly dismisses the Green Belt purpose To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character". 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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The report does not refer to any community involvement or what is sought locally. It does not account for the 2009 Character Assessment of Mayford. The scale of proposals would have a very significant impact on the village, change its dynamics and balance.	None stated.	The methodology used to carry out the review underwent targeted consultation to ensure that it provides a robust basis for the review. Whilst the study itself has not been subjected to public consultation, any comments raised about it has been addressed as part of responding to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence base studies and they collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Mayford. 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The report does not refer to any community involvement or what is sought locally. It does not account for the 2009 Character Assessment of Mayford. The scale of proposals would have a very significant impact on the village, change	None stated.	The methodology used to carry out the review underwent targeted consultation to ensure that it provides a robust basis for the review. Whilst the study itself has not been subjected to public consultation, any comments raised about it has been addressed as part of responding to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence base	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				its dynamics and balance.		studies and they collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Mayford. 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.	
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The report does not refer to any community involvement or what is sought locally. It does not account for the 2009 Character Assessment of Mayford. The scale of proposals would have a very significant impact on the village, change its dynamics and balance.	None stated.	The methodology used to carry out the review underwent targeted consultation to ensure that it provides a robust basis for the review. Whilst the study itself has not been subjected to public consultation, any comments raised about it has been addressed as part of responding to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence base studies and they collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Mayford. 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The report does not refer to any community involvement or what is sought locally. It does not account for the 2009 Character Assessment of Mayford. The scale of proposals would have a very significant impact on the village, change its dynamics and balance.	None stated.	The methodology used to carry out the review underwent targeted consultation to ensure that it provides a robust basis for the review. Whilst the study itself has not been subjected to public consultation, any comments raised about it has been addressed as part of responding to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence base studies and they collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Mayford. 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The report does not refer to any community involvement or what is sought locally. It does not account for the 2009 Character Assessment of Mayford. The scale of proposals would have a very significant impact on the village, change its dynamics and balance.	None stated.	The methodology used to carry out the review underwent targeted consultation to ensure that it provides a robust basis for the review. Whilst the study itself has not been subjected to public consultation, any comments raised about it has been addressed as part of responding to the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence base studies and they collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Mayford. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Insufficient weight has been places on factors such as the limitations of the highway network, areas of flood plain and the status of the village with listed buildings and conservation areas. Although sites will still be subject to the normal planning process that would deal with this, there should have been greater depth of consideration (e.g. conceptual models) in assessing the viability of each site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11), 5.0 and 19.0. The detail referred to about the viability of sites and conceptual models will become available through the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	Insufficient weight has been places on factors such as the limitations of the highway network, areas of flood plain and the status of the village with listed buildings and conservation areas. Although sites will still be subject to the normal planning process that would deal with this, there should have been greater depth of consideration (e.g. conceptual models) in assessing the viability of each site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11), 5.0 and 19.0. The detail referred to about the viability of sites and conceptual models will become available through the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	Insufficient weight has been places on factors such as the limitations of the highway network, areas of flood plain and the status of the village with listed buildings and conservation areas. Although sites will still be subject to the normal planning process that would deal with this, there should have been greater depth of consideration (e.g. conceptual models) in assessing the viability of each site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11), 5.0 and 19.0. The detail referred to about the viability of sites and conceptual models will become available through the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	Insufficient weight has been places on factors such as the limitations of the highway network, areas of flood plain and the status of the village with listed buildings and conservation areas. Although sites will still be subject to the normal planning process that would deal with this, there should have been greater depth of consideration (e.g. conceptual models) in assessing the viability of each site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11), 5.0 and 19.0. The detail referred to about the viability of sites and conceptual models will become available through the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	Insufficient weight has been places on factors such as the limitations of the highway network, areas of flood plain and the status of the village with listed buildings and conservation areas. Although sites will still be subject to the normal planning process that would deal with this, there should have been greater depth of consideration (e.g. conceptual models) in assessing the viability of each site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11), 5.0 and 19.0. The detail referred to about the viability of sites and conceptual models will become available through the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	Quotes Core Strategy Policy CS14, CS21 and CS24 and Policy H of the PPFTS with the general intention that development should positively contribute to visual amenity, local character, street scene, environment and openness. For additional pitches to comply with design principles set out in government practice guidance 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites' (May 2008) in terms of amenity buildings and hard-standings, there will be adverse impacts on the openness, character and appearance of the area, a dominating effect on the nearest settled community and reduced amenity value, contrary to the stated policies.	None 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
563	Simon	Curry	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	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 Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The report and 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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The report and 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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The report and 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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The report and 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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The report and 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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape 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
563	Simon	Curry	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.	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
563	Simon	Curry	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 road, 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.	
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	<p>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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.</p>	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	<p>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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.</p>	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	<p>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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.</p>	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	<p>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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.</p>	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	<p>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'.</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, 2 and 4. The use of Green Belt land to meet the needs of Traveller at Ten Acre Farm is particularly addressed in Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the site is best place to help meet the needs of Travellers when compared with other alternatives.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	<p>A considerable sum of money was spent by WBC on consultants to evaluate the Green Belt for development suitability. This was premature as the fun should have neem used on a comprehensive review of all brownfield sites available now and in future. The lack of such an external professional study undermines the basis of current proposals.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.</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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	A considerable sum of money was spent by WBC on consultants to evaluate the Green Belt for development suitability. This was premature as the fun should have neem used on a comprehensive review of all brownfield sites available now and in future. The lack of such an external professional study undermines the basis of current proposals.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	A considerable sum of money was spent by WBC on consultants to evaluate the Green Belt for development suitability. This was premature as the fun should have neem used on a comprehensive review of all brownfield sites available now and in future. The lack of such an external professional study undermines the basis of current proposals.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	A considerable sum of money was spent by WBC on consultants to evaluate the Green Belt for development suitability. This was premature as the fun should have neem used on a comprehensive review of all brownfield sites available now and in future. The lack of such an external professional study undermines the basis of current proposals.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	A considerable sum of money was spent by WBC on consultants to evaluate the Green Belt for development suitability. This was premature as the fun should have neem used on a comprehensive review of all brownfield sites available now and in future. The lack of such an external professional study undermines the basis of current proposals.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Attracted to the area (borders of Mayford and Hook Heath) because of its peaceful rural setting. If development goes ahead Mayford will become an urban suburb of Woking and lose its unique village character. This should be protected as Mayford village has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The representation regarding landscape and village character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0. 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	Attracted to the area (borders of Mayford and Hook Heath) because of its peaceful rural setting. If development goes ahead Mayford will become an urban suburb of Woking and lose its unique village character. This should be protected as Mayford village has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The representation regarding landscape and village character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.  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
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	Attracted to the area (borders of Mayford and Hook Heath) because of its peaceful rural setting. If development goes ahead Mayford will become an urban suburb of Woking and lose its unique village character. This should be protected as Mayford village has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The representation regarding landscape and village character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.  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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	Attracted to the area (borders of Mayford and Hook Heath) because of its peaceful rural setting. If development goes ahead Mayford will become an urban suburb of Woking and lose its unique village character. This should be protected as Mayford village has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The representation regarding landscape and village character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.  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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	Attracted to the area (borders of Mayford and Hook Heath) because of its peaceful rural setting. If development goes ahead Mayford will become an urban suburb of Woking and lose its unique village character. This should be protected as Mayford village has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The representation regarding landscape and village character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.  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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Opposed to releasing sites from the Green Belt for development of any kind for the following reasons: - Green Belt is meant to protect towns from merging, and in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	The justification for allocation of additional Travellers Pitches at this site is flawed for the following reasons. The landowner has not confirmed availability of the site and should be removed from the DPD. At the time of the Green Belt Review the site was promoted for residential development but unavailable for increased Traveller accommodation. The has not changed and the owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use.	The site should be removed from 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The Mayford Village Society represents 700 residents of Mayford. This is their formal response to the DPD. Acknowledge the need for housing development in the UK and the pressures on the Council, but believe that the justification for performing a Green Belt Review is significantly flawed.	None stated.	The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in 2012. Policy CS6: Green Belt states that the Green Belt has been identified as a potential future direction of growth to meet housing need, between 2022 and 2027. A Green Belt review will be carried out with the specific objective to identify land to meet the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This was agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. By carrying out a Green Belt boundary review, the Council has followed what it had set out to do within the Core Strategy and with what was agreed at the examination. This has been addressed in further detail within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.7 to 1.13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The Mayford Village Society represents 700 residents of Mayford. This is their formal response to the DPD. Acknowledge the need for housing development in the UK and the pressures on the Council, but believe that the justification for performing a Green Belt Review is significantly flawed.	None stated.	The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in 2012. Policy CS6: Green Belt states that the Green Belt has been identified as a potential future direction of growth to meet housing need, between 2022 and 2027. A Green Belt review will be carried out with the specific objective to identify land to meet the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This was agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. By carrying out a Green Belt boundary review, the Council has followed what it had set out to do within the Core Strategy and with what was agreed at the examination.  This has been addressed in further detail within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.7 to 1.13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The Mayford Village Society represents 700 residents of Mayford. This is their formal response to the DPD. Acknowledge the need for housing development in the UK and the pressures on the Council, but believe that the justification for performing a Green Belt Review is significantly flawed.	None stated.	The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in 2012. Policy CS6: Green Belt states that the Green Belt has been identified as a potential future direction of growth to meet housing need, between 2022 and 2027. A Green Belt review will be carried out with the specific objective to identify land to meet the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This was agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. By carrying out a Green Belt boundary review, the Council has followed what it had set out to do within the Core Strategy and with what was agreed at the examination.  This has been addressed in further detail within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.7 to 1.13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The Mayford Village Society represents 700 residents of Mayford. This is their formal response to the DPD. Acknowledge the need for housing development in the UK and the pressures on the Council, but believe that the justification for performing a Green Belt Review is significantly flawed.	None stated.	The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in 2012. Policy CS6: Green Belt states that the Green Belt has been identified as a potential future direction of growth to meet housing need, between 2022 and 2027. A Green Belt review will be carried out with the specific objective to identify land to meet the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This was agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. By carrying out a Green Belt boundary review, the Council has followed what it had set out to do within the Core Strategy and with what was agreed at the examination.  This has been addressed in further detail within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.7 to 1.13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The Mayford Village Society represents 700 residents of Mayford. This is their formal response to the DPD. Acknowledge the need for housing development in the UK and the pressures on the Council, but believe that the justification for performing a Green Belt Review is significantly flawed.	None stated.	The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in 2012. Policy CS6: Green Belt states that the Green Belt has been identified as a potential future direction of growth to meet housing need, between 2022 and 2027. A Green Belt review will be carried out with the specific objective to identify land to meet the development requirements of the Core Strategy. This was agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. By carrying out a Green Belt boundary review, the Council has followed what it had set out to do within the Core Strategy and with what was agreed at the examination.  This has been addressed in further detail within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.7 to 1.13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Formally requests that the Council commission a Brownfield Site review as described before continuing, as without it the proposals to develop the Green Belt are wholly unjustified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	Formally requests that the Council commission a Brownfield Site review as described before continuing, as without it the proposals to develop the Green Belt are wholly unjustified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	Formally requests that the Council commission a Brownfield Site review as described before continuing, as without it the proposals to develop the Green Belt are wholly unjustified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	Formally requests that the Council commission a Brownfield Site review as described before continuing, as without it the proposals to develop the Green Belt are wholly unjustified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	Formally requests that the Council commission a Brownfield Site review as described before continuing, as without it the proposals to develop the Green Belt are wholly unjustified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	Formally requests that should the brownfield site study (request 1) justify development in Green Belt then a review of the Peter Brett report should be performed, accounting for the flaws identified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	Formally requests that should the brownfield site study (request 1) justify development in Green Belt then a review of the Peter Brett report should be performed, accounting for the flaws identified.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	Formally requests that should the brownfield site study (request 1) justify development in Green Belt then a review of the Peter Brett report should be performed, accounting for the flaws identified.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Peter Brett report on the Green Belt boundary review is sufficiently robust to be used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The methodology covers the necessary information that needed to be sought to make informed decisions and have been consistently applied. The conclusion of the study follows the analysis of the data in a coherent matter. The study has been carried out in accordance with the Consultants brief. This matter has been addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	Formally requests that should the brownfield site study (request 1) justify development in Green Belt then a review of the Peter Brett report should be performed, accounting for the flaws identified.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Peter Brett report on the Green Belt boundary review is sufficiently robust to be used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The methodology covers the necessary information that needed to be sought to make informed decisions and have been consistently applied. The conclusion of the study follows the analysis of the data in a coherent matter. The study has been carried out in accordance with the Consultants brief. This matter has been addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	Formally requests that should the brownfield site study (request 1) justify development in Green Belt then a review of the Peter Brett report should be performed, accounting for the flaws identified.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the Peter Brett report on the Green Belt boundary review is sufficiently robust to be used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The methodology covers the necessary information that needed to be sought to make informed decisions and have been consistently applied. The conclusion of the study follows the analysis of the data in a coherent matter. The study has been carried out in accordance with the Consultants brief. This matter has been addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB7	Requests that the identification of suitable Traveller Pitches is re-performed, removing Ten Acre Farm from the possible sites due to the lack of viability as described.	The site should be removed from 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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	In addition to the need to develop Green Belt being unjustified, as described, the Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal documents have a number of serious flaws (despite providing a theoretical and analytical assessment of availability, sustainability and deliverability), including that there is no obvious reference to where evidence has been sourced. Additionally the report does not appear to cover the practicalities on the impact of development.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	In addition to the need to develop Green Belt being unjustified, as described, the Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal documents have a number of serious flaws (despite providing a theoretical and analytical assessment of availability, sustainability and deliverability), including that there is no obvious reference to where evidence has been sourced. Additionally the report does not appear to cover the practicalities on the impact of development.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	In addition to the need to develop Green Belt being unjustified, as described, the Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal documents have a number of serious flaws (despite providing a theoretical and analytical assessment of availability, sustainability and deliverability), including that there is no obvious reference to where evidence has been sourced. Additionally the report does not appear to cover the practicalities on the impact of development.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	In addition to the need to develop Green Belt being unjustified, as described, the Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal documents have a number of serious flaws (despite providing a theoretical and analytical assessment of availability, sustainability and deliverability), including that there is no obvious reference to where evidence has been sourced. Additionally the report does not appear to cover the practicalities on the impact of development.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	In addition to the need to develop Green Belt being unjustified, as described, the Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal documents have a number of serious flaws (despite providing a theoretical and analytical assessment of availability, sustainability and deliverability), including that there is no obvious reference to where evidence has been sourced. Additionally the report does not appear to cover the practicalities on the impact of development.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	The reason for the review, including allocation of Green Belt sites for future development, is that the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for future development. The society believe this is not correct for two reasons, firstly that the method of identifying brownfield sites is not comprehensive or complete. A directory of landowners are requested to put forward land periodically, which is haphazard and prone to error with suitable land and development opportunities omitted and overlooked. This is proven by the fact that the consultation process requests residents and residents associations to identify suitable land on their behalf. This shows a lack of structured method and analysis to ensure all potential brownfield site have been identified.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	The reason for the review, including allocation of Green Belt sites for future development, is that the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for future development. The society believe this is not correct for two reasons, firstly that the method of identifying brownfield sites is not comprehensive or complete. A directory of landowners are requested to put forward land periodically, which is haphazard and prone to error with suitable land and development opportunities omitted and overlooked. This is proven by the fact that the consultation process requests	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
				residents and residents associations to identify suitable land on their behalf. This shows a lack of structured method and analysis to ensure all potential brownfield site have been identified.			
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	The reason for the review, including allocation of Green Belt sites for future development, is that the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for future development. The society believe this is not correct for two reasons, firstly that the method of identifying brownfield sites is not comprehensive or complete. A directory of landowners are requested to put forward land periodically, which is haphazard and prone to error with suitable land and development opportunities omitted and overlooked. This is proven by the fact that the consultation process requests residents and residents associations to identify suitable land on their behalf. This shows a lack of structured method and analysis to ensure all potential brownfield site have been identified.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	The reason for the review, including allocation of Green Belt sites for future development, is that the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for future development. The society believe this is not correct for two reasons, firstly that the method of identifying brownfield sites is not comprehensive or complete. A directory of landowners are requested to put forward land periodically, which is haphazard and prone to error with suitable land and development opportunities omitted and overlooked. This is proven by the fact that the consultation process requests residents and residents associations to identify suitable land on their behalf. This shows a lack of structured method and analysis to ensure all potential brownfield site have been identified.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	The reason for the review, including allocation of Green Belt sites for future development, is that the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for future development. The society believe this is not correct for two reasons, firstly that the method of identifying brownfield sites is not comprehensive or complete. A directory of landowners are requested to put forward land periodically, which is haphazard and prone to error with suitable land and development opportunities omitted and overlooked. This is proven by the fact that the consultation process requests residents and residents associations to identify suitable land on their behalf. This shows a lack of structured method and analysis to ensure all potential brownfield site have been identified.	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
563	Simon	Curry	GB8	This point [lack of analysis of brownfield site availability in 12-25 years time] is particularly pertinent due to the Government's continued protection of the Green Belt and their announcement that need for housing including travellers site does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development, and proposals to accelerate planning permissions do not create need to build on the Green Belt	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development and recent Ministerial Statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.12.  The representation regarding the lack of brownfield site assessment has been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB9	This point [lack of analysis of brownfield site availability in 12-25 years time] is particularly pertinent due to the Government's continued protection of the Green Belt and their announcement that need for housing including travellers site does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development, and proposals to accelerate planning permissions do not create need to build on the Green Belt	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development and recent Ministerial Statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.12.  The representation regarding the lack of brownfield site assessment has been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
563	Simon	Curry	GB10	This point [lack of analysis of brownfield site availability in 12-25 years time] is particularly pertinent due to the Government's continued protection of the Green Belt and their announcement that need for housing including travellers site does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development, and proposals to accelerate planning permissions do not create need to build on the Green Belt	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development and recent Ministerial Statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.12. The representation regarding the lack of brownfield site assessment has been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB11	This point [lack of analysis of brownfield site availability in 12-25 years time] is particularly pertinent due to the Government's continued protection of the Green Belt and their announcement that need for housing including travellers site does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development, and proposals to accelerate planning permissions do not create need to build on the Green Belt	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development and recent Ministerial Statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.12.  The representation regarding the lack of brownfield site assessment has been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
563	Simon	Curry	GB14	This point [lack of analysis of brownfield site availability in 12-25 years time] is particularly pertinent due to the Government's continued protection of the Green Belt and their announcement that need for housing including travellers site does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development, and proposals to accelerate planning permissions do not create need to build on the Green Belt	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development and recent Ministerial Statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.12.  The representation regarding the lack of brownfield site assessment has been addressed in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	While there may be special circumstances to site a school on Green Belt, this is not the right place due poor road and transport infrastructure, and impacts on an already heavily congested road, which is the main artery between Woking and Guildford. Suggests a rethink to consider redevelopment of Highlands and Westfield school.	Highlands and Westfield school with its large field could be redeveloped with a shared area for outdoor activity.	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 9.0. Further detail on the reasoning for locating the school at the Egley Road site can be found in the report on the planning application and in supporting information, which can be found by searching for planning application reference searching for PLAN/2015/0703 at <a href="http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/publicaccess">http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/publicaccess</a> .	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	The site does not meet the Council's own guidelines for prospective traveller sites: that they should have space for related business activities, adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities, and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. With regard to business activities, please see Section 4.0 (paragraph 4.12) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The area is flood plan, and there are various local flood events, which will be exacerbated with further development.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0, with further detail about sewers in Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The area is flood plan, and there are various local flood events, which will be exacerbated with further development.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0, with further detail about sewers in Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The area is flood plan, and there are various local flood events, which will be exacerbated with further development.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0, with further detail about sewers in Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	The area is use for leisure purposes by local residents (walking, dog walking, enjoyment of nature) which will be destroyed.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						integrity.	
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The sites are earmarked for housing despite WBC's 2011 assurances that the village should only have infill development. The agricultural /rural history of the village would be permanently sacrificed, and green space cannot be reintroduced.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS6: Green Belt, does state that Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map is suitable for infill development as it is 'washed over' by the Green Belt. The proposed Site Allocations DPD does not intend to remove the Green Belt designation from Mayford Village and therefore Green Belt policies will continue to be applied. Nevertheless the proposed allocations around Mayford are not within the Mayford Village area (see Proposals Map). The Council is proposing to 'safeguard' these sites for development needs post 2027. The sites are therefore not proposed for development until such time that they are required. To clarify, site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes. This will improve accessibility to open recreational space in the local area. In addition, the key requirements for the sites state that open space will be required as part of any development scheme. The representation regarding landscape and character has been 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The sites are earmarked for housing despite WBC's 2011 assurances that the village should only have infill development. The agricultural /rural history of the village would be permanently sacrificed, and green space cannot be reintroduced.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS6: Green Belt, does state that Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map is suitable for infill development as it is 'washed over' by the Green Belt. The proposed Site Allocations DPD does not intend to remove the Green Belt designation from Mayford Village and therefore Green Belt policies will continue to be applied. Nevertheless the proposed allocations around Mayford are not within the Mayford Village area (see Proposals Map). The Council is proposing to 'safeguard' these sites for development needs post 2027. The sites are therefore not proposed for development until such time that they are required.  To clarify, site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes. This will improve accessibility to open recreational space in the local area. In addition, the key requirements for the sites state that open space will be required as part of any development scheme.  The representation regarding landscape and character has been 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The sites are earmarked for housing despite WBC's 2011 assurances that the village should only have infill development. The agricultural /rural history of the village would be permanently sacrificed, and green space cannot be reintroduced.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS6: Green Belt, does state that Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map is suitable for infill development as it is 'washed over' by the Green Belt. The proposed Site Allocations DPD does not intend to remove the Green Belt designation from Mayford Village and therefore Green Belt policies will continue to be applied. Nevertheless the proposed allocations around Mayford are not within the Mayford Village area (see Proposals Map). The Council is proposing to 'safeguard' these sites for development needs post 2027. The sites are therefore not proposed for development until such time that they are required.  To clarify, site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes. This will improve accessibility to open recreational space in the local area. In addition, the key requirements for the sites state that open space will be required as part of any development scheme.  The representation regarding landscape and character has been 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	The alleged secondary school has two very significant additions: A commercial leisure centre, pretending to be a school facility, which is not needed as there is a leisure centre about a mile away. There is also lots of availability at other venues locally. Football and MUGA pitches are also included, but these facilities at Woking Leisure centre are underused. Also Mayford has an unmaintained pitch by the village hall that could easily be improved, and football pitches at Mayford football club. These facilities are not required; 2. The running track is purely there because it is being re-sited from Sheerwater, but this is not a reason for removing Green Belt land. The plans show spectator seating and 2000 people attending weekly events in the summer. This is not appropriate in the village. Asks if there is a hidden agenda behind the application.	None stated.	The proposal now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	Upset at the release of the garden centre which provides pleasure for local people and a valuable source of employment for teens and older residents, who are unable to	None stated.	Objection noted. While the role that the Post office/ shop plays is acknowledged and noted, the increase in the population expected as a result of the development proposed in this document would place greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in Mayford. 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
				travel somewhere further afield. There is a need to retain the garden centre for the health and well-being of Mayford's community, as a cafe, meeting spot (often for garden discussions) and local employment centre. Woking is overlaid and does not need more supermarkets, and Mayford does not need for than the Post office/shop.		opportunity to provide an greater element of retail/community development at site GB9 would help to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. This development could help provide an alternative community resource to that currently provided at the garden centre.	
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. Objects to any loss of Green Belt. WBC has already bought a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt. Thinks this is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. This development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB9	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. Objects to any loss of Green Belt. WBC has already bought a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt. Thinks this is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. This development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. Objects to any loss of Green Belt. WBC has already bought a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt. Thinks this is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. This development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. Objects to any loss of Green Belt. WBC has already bought a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt. Thinks this is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. This development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB14	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. Objects to any loss of Green Belt. WBC has already bought a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt. Thinks this is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. This development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	Feels WBC are set on destroying Mayford and its community. It has already bought a plot at havering Farm for SANGs to replace loss of Green Belt, which is supposed to happen after a decision is approved, which has not	None stated.	The Council does not believe that the proposals will destroy the area, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0, 22.0 and 23.0. SANGs are not provided to replace the loss of Green Belt. They help to mitigate the impact and provide alternative open spaces (to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) for the recreation use of future occupants of new residential development. 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
				happened yet. Suggests the Council reconsider the plans.		development is predominantly within the urban area. It is also good planning to ensure adequate land for SANGs is provided alongside, and where appropriate, as part of the development of the draft Site Allocations DPD, to ensure sufficient SANG land for the development proposed within the document. Making provision for SANG land only after the draft DPD is approved, as suggested in the representation, would not represent a sustainable or future proof approach to dealing with this issue.	
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	Objects to the proposals. The Government have reiterated that Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB9	Objects to the proposals. The Government have reiterated that Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	Objects to the proposals. The Government have reiterated that Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	Objects to the proposals. The Government have reiterated that Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	Objects to the proposals. The Government have reiterated that Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3 and for further background on the justification for release of Green Belt sites for development, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. With regard to the justification for the development in a Green Belt location, this is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	States that putting three applications in one is an underhand trick, which will be used to as an excuse to proceed with filling remaining space with houses, completely against Green Belt policy. The buildings will dwarf the small scale of development and character of the neighbourhood. It will not improve the 'well-being' of local Egley Road residents.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The recent planning application for the secondary school and associated leisure facilities were brought forward before the Plan making process was allowed to run its course. Nevertheless the application was determined on its own individual merits and the case was successfully put forward for very special circumstances for development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The key requirements for the proposed allocation, alongside the existing and emerging policies and guidance of the Council should make sure that future development of the site will achieve a satisfactory relationship to the surrounding landscape and townscape character and not have a significant impact on the well-being of local residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	Several applications have previously been refused on the 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The road and transport infrastructure is overburdened with heavy traffic, and bottlenecks at Victoria Arch, Slyfield and at single track road over railways at Hook Hill, Saunders Lane and Hook Heath. Development will worsen this and shows that Mayford is unsuitable for 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The road and transport infrastructure is overburdened with heavy traffic, and bottlenecks at Victoria Arch, Slyfield and at single track road over railways at Hook Hill, Saunders Lane and Hook Heath. Development will worsen this and shows that Mayford is unsuitable for 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The road and transport infrastructure is overburdened with heavy traffic, and bottlenecks at Victoria Arch, Slyfield and at single track road over railways at Hook Hill, Saunders Lane and Hook Heath. Development will worsen this and shows that Mayford is unsuitable for 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB7	There is a focus on completely getting rid of Mayford Village by filling in all available green land between Woking and Mayford. This is contrary to the Core Strategy (CS) which states that Mayford Village is designated as an 'infill only settlement within the Green Belt'. Mayford's fields prevent	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. The Council does not intend to 'get rid' of Mayford village' and its special character is recognised by the Council. 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 its Green Belt surroundings. In terms 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
				urban sprawl from Woking and create a noticeable difference, to a semi-rural environment, when leaving Woking's built up area. Mayford is a small, compact community. Limited development within the village boundaries would not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt, and the CS states infill residential development will normally be acceptable. It also states that new build business or industrial development will not be allowed due to their effect on the residential character of the village. Nothing has changed since the CS, so asks why Mayford is targeted for destruction.		the reason and justification for development in Mayford, these allocations are proposed to help meet future development requirements in the Core Strategy, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0, and in terms of safeguarded sites, in Section 2.0.	
574	Jackie	Curry	GB8	There is a focus on completely getting rid of Mayford Village by filling in all available green land between Woking and Mayford. This is contrary to the Core Strategy (CS) which states that Mayford Village is designated as an 'infill only settlement within the Green Belt'. Mayford's fields prevent urban sprawl from Woking and create a noticeable difference, to a semi-rural environment, when leaving Woking's built up area. Mayford is a small, compact community. Limited development within the village boundaries would not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt, and the CS states infill residential development will normally be acceptable. It also states that new build business or industrial development will not be allowed due to their effect on the residential character of the village. Nothing has changed since the CS, so asks why Mayford is targeted for destruction.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. The Council does not intend to 'get rid' of Mayford village' and its special character is recognised by the Council. 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 its Green Belt surroundings. In terms of the reason and justification for development in Mayford, these allocations are proposed to help meet future development requirements in the Core Strategy, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0, and in terms of safeguarded sites, in Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB9	There is a focus on completely getting rid of Mayford Village by filling in all available green land between Woking and Mayford. This is contrary to the Core Strategy (CS) which states that Mayford Village is designated as an 'infill only settlement within the Green Belt'. Mayford's fields prevent urban sprawl from Woking and create a noticeable difference, to a semi-rural environment, when leaving Woking's built up area. Mayford is a small, compact community. Limited development within the village boundaries would not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt, and the CS states infill residential development will normally be acceptable. It also states that new build business or industrial development will not be allowed due to their effect on the residential character of the village. Nothing has changed since the CS, so asks why Mayford is targeted for destruction.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. The Council does not intend to 'get rid' of Mayford village' and its special character is recognised by the Council. 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 its Green Belt surroundings. In terms of the reason and justification for development in Mayford, these allocations are proposed to help meet future development requirements in the Core Strategy, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0, and in terms of safeguarded sites, in Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
574	Jackie	Curry	GB10	There is a focus on completely getting rid of Mayford Village by filling in all available green land between Woking and Mayford. This is contrary to the Core Strategy (CS) which states that Mayford Village is designated as an 'infill only settlement within the Green Belt'. Mayford's fields prevent urban sprawl from Woking and create a noticeable difference, to a semi-rural environment, when leaving Woking's built up area. Mayford is a small, compact community. Limited development within the village boundaries would not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt, and the CS states infill residential development will normally be acceptable. It also states that new build business or industrial development will not be allowed due to their effect on the residential character of the village. Nothing has changed since the CS, so asks why Mayford is targeted for destruction.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. The Council does not intend to 'get rid' of Mayford village' and its special character is recognised by the Council. 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 its Green Belt surroundings. In terms of the reason and justification for development in Mayford, these allocations are proposed to help meet future development requirements in the Core Strategy, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0, and in terms of safeguarded sites, in 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
574	Jackie	Curry	GB11	There is a focus on completely getting rid of Mayford Village by filling in all available green land between Woking and Mayford. This is contrary to the Core Strategy (CS) which states that Mayford Village is designated as an 'infill only settlement within the Green Belt'. Mayford's fields prevent urban sprawl from Woking and create a noticeable difference, to a semi-rural environment, when leaving Woking's built up area. Mayford is a small, compact community. Limited development within the village boundaries would not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt, and the CS states infill residential development will normally be acceptable. It also states that new build business or industrial development will not be allowed due to their effect on the residential character of the village. Nothing has changed since the CS, so asks why Mayford is targeted for destruction.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. The Council does not intend to 'get rid' of Mayford village' and its special character is recognised by the Council. 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 its Green Belt surroundings. In terms of the reason and justification for development in Mayford, these allocations are proposed to help meet future development requirements in the Core Strategy, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0, and in terms of safeguarded sites, in Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB7	The site fails to provide space for business activities, adequate infrastructure, on-site utilities and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding business related activities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12.</p> <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.</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 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The area contains a number of flood plains. Further development in the area will exacerbate the problem.	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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The area contains a number of flood plains. Further development in the area will exacerbate the problem.	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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The area contains a number of flood plains. Further development in the area will exacerbate the problem.	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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB7	It is an area used for leisure purposes and will be destroyed.	None stated.	The proposed allocation does not result in the loss of publically accessible open space. Therefore leisure and recreation activities in the local area will not be reduced as a result of the proposal. It is noted that the site is adjacent to a SSSI and the combination of the plan-making and development management processes will ensure that the expansion of the proposed site will not undermine the landscape character of the area. It is also emphasised that the requirements of the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS24: Woking's landscape and townscape will apply to any proposal that would come forward to develop the proposed site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	General	WBC is hell-bent on destroying the area and has already bought Havering Farm to use as SANGs to replace Green Belt lost. This is supposed to happen after decisions have been approved. There is yet to be a completed Public Consultation and Approval. Strongly suggest to reconsider and objects to the loss of Green Belt in Mayford as it is a whole community destroyed.	None stated.	The response to the impact on local character is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The draft Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate the land at Havering Farm as a SANG. The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period, with the proposed sites identified as GB18 to GB22.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB9	Upsetting to think that the old Nursery buildings of a popular garden centre are included in the proposals. It is valuable to local people, whilst also creating employment opportunities.	None stated.	One of the key requirements for the proposed site allocation is the relocation of the existing local business. Although it currently generates employment opportunities, the proposed allocation identifies the opportunity to provide an element of retail and/or community development on the site. This could also generate employment opportunities. It is noted 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 existing garden centre provides a valuable source of pleasure to local residents.	
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB8	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevents urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would be suitable. New business and industrial development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being targeted for destruction?	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015).</p> <p>It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB9	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevent urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would be suitable. New business and industrial development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being targeted for destruction?	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015).</p> <p>It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB10	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevent urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would be suitable. New business and industrial development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being targeted for destruction?	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015). It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites. This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB11	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevent urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would be suitable. New business and industrial development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015).</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
				targeted for destruction?		<p>It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB14	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevent urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being targeted for destruction?	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015). It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites. This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB7	Objects to proposals. National Government state that Green Belts should be protected. WBC have focused development on Mayford in order to complete remove Mayford as a village. This will infill the land between Mayford and Woking. This is against CS6 of the Core Strategy which states that Mayford Village is an infill settlement. This land prevent urban sprawl towards Guildford. They have visual amenity value. To protect Mayford's character, infill development would not be allowed due to impacts on residential character, as stated in the Core Strategy. Why is Mayford being targeted for destruction?	None stated.	<p>Whilst there has been further recent 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. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. This is necessary to meet a clearly stated national objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Government's commitment to housing delivery as a key driver to high productivity in the economy is further emphasised in 'fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation'; presented to parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (2015).</p> <p>It is correct that the Core Strategy seeks to protect the character of Mayford Village through only permitting infill development. This policy applies to Mayford Village as defined on the Proposals Map, which does not extend to the areas within the proposed allocated sites.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB9	It is part of the fabric of Mayford and is important for the health and well-being of local people. The loss of the garden centre would result in people having to travel further which many older people can not do. Therefore strongly object. Woking has many supermarkets and Mayford does not need more than the existing post office and shop.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that the existing business on the site is well used by the local community. The key requirements for the site as set out in the DPD state that the existing business should be relocated prior to development.</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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB8	The school, leisure centre and track as one application is an underhanded trick and will be used by WBC to proceed with infilling the remaining spaces with houses, against Green Belt policy. The buildings are significantly larger than the adjacent houses and therefore has a negative impact on local character. It will not improve the well-being of Egley Road residents.	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. The recent planning application for the secondary school and associated leisure facilities were brought forward before the Plan making process was allowed to run its course. Nevertheless the application was determined on its own individual merits and the case was successfully put forward for very special circumstances for development in the Green Belt. The key requirements for the proposed allocation, alongside the existing and emerging policies and guidance of the Council should make sure that future development of the site will achieve a satisfactory relationship to the surrounding landscape and townscape character and not have a significant impact on the well-being of local 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB7	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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The road system and existing infrastructure in Mayford Village is inadequate and due to high costs, unlikely to be improved. Mayford is unsuitable for 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The road system and existing infrastructure in Mayford Village is inadequate and due to high costs, unlikely to be improved. Mayford is unsuitable for 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The road system and existing infrastructure in Mayford Village is inadequate and due to high costs, unlikely to be improved. Mayford is unsuitable for 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB8	The track is only proposed as it is a replacement for Sheerwater and not a reason to remove Green Belt land. The seating areas are significant and is not an appropriate use in a village. Strongly object. What is the hidden agenda behind the application?	None stated.	The proposed running track at Egley Road (GB8) is to replace the existing facility in Sheerwater. The track is considered to be a Borough wide facility and therefore its relocation is not expected to have a negative impact on sports provision within the Borough. The proposed track and associated facilities have been deemed suitable and appropriate by the Local Planning Authority, Sport England and the National Planning Casework Unit as the site now has planning permission for this sports facility.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB10	The site is identified for housing and despite WBC stating that only infill will be acceptable, it will turn into another Goldworth Park. Mayford's history will be destroyed and green space will be lost forever.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas.  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 history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB11	The site is identified for housing and despite WBC stating that only infill will be acceptable, it will turn into another Goldworth Park. Mayford's history will be destroyed and green space will be lost forever.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. 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 history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. 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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB14	The site is identified for housing and despite WBC stating that only infill will be acceptable, it will turn into another Goldworth Park. Mayford's history will be destroyed and green space will be lost forever.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas.  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 history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  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
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB8	The proposal for a school has included a very significant addition, a commercial leisure centre. It is not a school facility as the school will need to book use of the facilities. There is no need locally as Woking Leisure Centre is less than a mile away. Generally it is not needed at the school.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egleby Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine 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 pitches at Woking Leisure Centre are not used and the same could happen at this site. It would be better to maintain the pitch by the village hall. Strongly object to the application.		pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school, as set out in the Officers Report for the Planning Committee. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance. The Core Strategy sets out the requirements for open space and sport provision in the Borough. As per Policy CS17, outdoor sports facilities will be provided to meet identified demand and shortfall. Woking Leisure Centre serves a wide catchment area, providing sports and recreation facilities to a wide range of people across the Borough. As noted above, the proposed Leisure Centre on Egley Road will serve the proposed Hoe Valley Free School as well as provide the local community with a leisure facility in close proximity. The football pitch noted within the representation next to Mayford Village Hall would not be suitable in size or proximity to serve a secondary school. Neither would the football pitches at Mayford Football Club/The Mayford Centre. It should be noted that football is usually only one part of the sporting curriculum requirements. The representation notes that Woking Leisure Centre could serve the proposed school as it is within walking distance. To clarify the proposed school is 1.2 miles from Woking Leisure Centre on foot and therefore not within reasonable walking distance for sports lessons and activities.	
1625	Jackie	Curry	GB8	Whilst a school might be special circumstances on Green Belt, this is not the correct location. The road are congested, and more imaginative solutions should be considered to solving school shortages than placing one with a poor road and transport infrastructure. A rethink of Highlands and Westfield School could be redeveloped.	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 key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. 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 proposed location for the secondary school at Highlands and Westfield School is noted by the Council. However the loss of sports fields is strongly resisted by both local and national planning policy. In addition, it is not considered that the proposed site is available or suitable for a new school in addition to the educational facilities on site at present. The planning application for Hoe Valley Free School set out the lack of alternative sites within the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	Woking Council and ex-councillors have an interest in the proposals and therefore not a fair democratic process.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Local Planning Authority is separate to Woking Borough Council as a developer or landowner. The role of the Local Planning Authority is clearly set out within Planning legislation and each planning application is determined on its own merits. The proposed scheme for a new school was granted planning permission at Planning Committee which is a Council meeting that is open to the public for viewing. In addition, the scheme was not Called-In by the Secretary of State.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	How can this site be included when it is part of an existing planning application. The school could be justified under special circumstances but the leisure facility including track is not. The noise and parking issues will have a negative impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. This proposal along with Sheerwater will destroy two communities. Sport participation is declining since the Olympics.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD identifies strategic sites across the Borough for a wide range uses. The proposed school and leisure centre have come forward as part of the development management process and will be determine on its own merits. The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities 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
						site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. 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 traffic mitigation measures set out within the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. The proposed allocation of Sheerwater seeks to address a number of issues within the community. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS5: Priority Place. As set out in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy, the Sheerwater Athletics Track is a Borough wide facility and by relocating it within the Borough, it is not expected to have a negative impact on usage.	
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0.  In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB9	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0.  In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB10	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0.  In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB11	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0.  In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB14	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0.  In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB7	Not a long term plan as there is no joint working with Guildford and the surrounding area. The road are congested and will have a negative impact on Woking Town Centre. The proposed school and track will gridlock the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0. In addition, the recent planning application for the Hoe Valley Free School on Egley Road was considered by the County Highways Authority and not objection was raised based on the impact of the development on the highway in terms of traffic generation and congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	General	If you want to engage with local residents and businesses then talk to us and letters or local organisations. The destruction of Mayford will be detrimental to many of the existing small businesses. The only benefactors will be the Council and large developers with no connection with the area. An open discussion not in a hurried six weeks. The current plan shows no resemblance to the previous one. It will be changed again in few years and lead to more misery for residents of Mayford and the surrounding rural communities.	None stated.	The representation regarding the consultation process has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.  The proposed safeguarding of land for future development needs around Mayford and other parts of the Borough is not expected to have a negative impact on small businesses.  The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As set out, the Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy, which sets out the delivery of 4,964 dwellings including around 550 in the Green Belt between 2022 and 2027. The Council is also consistent with National Policy in identifying land for future development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB9	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Will the plans be even	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding 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
				more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.		<p>The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives 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 National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	
1626	Simon	Curry	GB10	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Will the plans be even more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.	None stated.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. 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. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB11	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Will the plans be even more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special	None stated.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.		See Section 23.0.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.The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	
1626	Simon	Curry	GB14	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Will the plans be even more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.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.The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Will the plans be even more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.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	No further modification is 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 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. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	
1626	Simon	Curry	GB7	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. The infill only development stated by the Council recently was to protect the village's character. The proposals will result in the wholesale destruction of the village and its character, which is mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Will the plans be even more drastic in the future? Maybe even more use of special circumstances to bulldoze through developments. What a way to protect a village community.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt states that infill residential development will be acceptable in principle in Mayford Village, as defined by the Proposals Map. The Council is not intending to change this policy or remove Mayford Village from the Green Belt, but is looking to safeguard land in the Green Belt around Mayford for future development needs post 2027. The Council has robust design policies in place to ensure that future development protects the character of Mayford and the surrounding areas. The representation regarding the history and character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. 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. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Authorities, when considering Green Belt boundary changes, should identify areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. The Council is believes that it is consistent with national policy and seeking to ensure that there is suitable land available for development up until 2040. Nevertheless the Council also recognises the important character of the various parts of the Borough. Core Strategy Policy CS21 clearly states that new development must respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Therefore it is not expected that by safeguarding land for future development, there will be a significant negative impact on Mayford Village or the local community. More information is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	It is understandable to build in some rural area but the Egley Road development is unacceptable as it will push through a major development disguised as a school and is not about the local community but short term political goals.	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
1626	Simon	Curry	GB7	Mayford already has a higher than average number of Traveller pitches, will there be a guarantee to ensure it will not be increase later or will it increase in a couple of years once revised.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD identifies potential Traveller sites in the Borough to meet the identified need in the area over the Plan period (up to 2027). Future need and the exact location of further Traveller sites will be considered during the preparation of the next Local Plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB9	A recent council decision resulted in the removal of a structure on the site due to Green Belt policy. The proposals will not offer long term protection of the Green Belt or long term planning vision. The existing garden centre is popular locally and the proposals will not benefit the local community.	None stated.	The recent Council decision is based on the Development Management process. The reasons for this decision are available on the Council's website. The Plan Making process, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), require Local Planning Authorities to meet their local housing need and to safeguard land beyond the plan period when altering Green Belt boundaries. The Council believe that its approach is consistent with the NPPF. The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is 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 note that the existing business on the site is well used by the local community. The key requirements for the site as set out in the DPD state that the existing business should be relocated prior to development.	
1626	Simon	Curry	GB8	How many more times will Special Circumstances be used to justify building on Green Belt in Mayford.	None stated.	Paragraph 80 of the NPPF clearly sets out the five purposes of Green Belt. Development should therefore not undermine these purposes. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved expect in very special circumstances. In this instance development proposals are judged on their individual merits and their impact on the Green Belt and its openness. By identifying development sites in the Green Belt to meet the Borough's housing requirements, it is expected to prevent speculative development taking place in the Green Belt in the future and in doing so will make sure that it will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB10	The total destruction of Mayford's Green Belt will be complete. It is accepted that Mayford may have to take some development but the current proposal will destroy Mayford.	A new village at Havering Farm	<p>The Site Allocations DPD identifies a number of sites in the Green Belt to meet the existing and future development needs of the Borough. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated and consequently it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. Through robust design policies and guidance future development will be of a high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed modification to develop a new village at Havering Farm would result in substantial adverse effects on the landscape character of the area. This is due to the landscapes strong character and low capacity for change. In addition, development in this location would not be sustainable as it is beyond a reasonable walking distance to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and Woking Town Centre, and beyond walking distance of services and facilities such as doctor surgeries and schools. A mini-village with services and facilities would require more Green Belt land to be developed in order to accommodate non residential facilities. Some of the site is also located in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB11	The total destruction of Mayford's Green Belt will be complete. It is accepted that Mayford may have to take some development but the current proposal will destroy Mayford.	A new village at Havering Farm	<p>The Site Allocations DPD identifies a number of sites in the Green Belt to meet the existing and future development needs of the Borough. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated and consequently it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. Through robust design policies and guidance future development will be of a high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed modification to develop a new village at Havering Farm would result in substantial adverse effects on the landscape character of the area. This is due to the landscapes strong character and low capacity for change. In addition, development in this location would not be sustainable as it is beyond a reasonable walking distance to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and Woking Town Centre, and beyond walking distance of services and facilities such as doctor surgeries and schools. A mini-village with services and facilities would require more Green Belt land to be developed in order to accommodate non residential facilities. Some of the site is also located in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1626	Simon	Curry	GB14	The total destruction of Mayford's Green Belt will be complete. It is accepted that Mayford may have to take some development but the current proposal will destroy Mayford.	A new village at Havering Farm	<p>The Site Allocations DPD identifies a number of sites in the Green Belt to meet the existing and future development needs of the Borough. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated and consequently it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. Through robust design policies and guidance future development will be of a high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed modification to develop a new village at Havering Farm would result in substantial adverse effects on the landscape character of the area. This is due to the landscapes strong character and low capacity for change. In addition, development in this location would not be sustainable as it is beyond a reasonable walking distance to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and Woking Town Centre, and beyond walking distance of services and facilities such as doctor surgeries and schools. A mini-village with services and facilities would require more Green Belt land to be developed in order to accommodate non residential facilities. Some of the site is also located in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	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	No further modification is 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 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.		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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with road unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.		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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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.	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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).	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB11	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathland (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 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. The evidence suggest that the proposals will not undermining the landscape character of the area. It will also not undermine the physical separation between Guildford and Woking. These two issues are addressed in detail in Section 7 and 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper respectively	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 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. The evidence suggest that the proposals will not undermining the landscape character of the area. It will also not undermine the physical separation between Guildford and Woking. These two issues are addressed in detail in Section 7 and 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 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. The evidence suggest that the proposals will not undermining the landscape character of the area. It will also not undermine the physical separation between Guildford and Woking. These two issues are addressed in detail in Section 7 and 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, the impact on the character of this isolated village community. Development will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	Please reconsider your plans	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 landscape 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	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	No further modification is 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>only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>		<p>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.</p>	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB11	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB8	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				for 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.			
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB11	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has always been clear that the site at Egley Road referred to is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB8	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB9	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school proposal now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	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	No further modification is 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 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.		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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB8	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	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 of Transport 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB9	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle. 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. 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	GB10	<p>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 road 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 speed.</p>	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</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>people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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. 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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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 road 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. 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</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
						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.	
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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
242	Ruth A	Curtis	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	<p>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.</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
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB12	The medical facilities and schools are at capacity trying to cope with the existing population.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical 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 education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. 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 people in the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB13	The medical facilities and schools are at capacity trying to cope with the existing population.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical 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 education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. 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 people in the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB12	Public meetings a few years ago found that the field next to Upshot Lane was not suitable for development. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. It will also have a negative impact on the character of the village. Traffic will also be generated by development in West Byfleet and Wisley.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core</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>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 impact on Pyrford's attractiveness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB13	Public meetings a few years ago found that the field next to Upshot Lane was not suitable for development. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. It will also have a negative impact on the character of the village. Traffic will also be generated by development in West Byfleet and Wisley.	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 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 representation regarding the impact on Pyrford's attractiveness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB12	Save the Green Belt as it can not be replaced.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1550	VJ, JM	Curtis	GB13	Save the Green Belt as it can not be replaced.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB12	All junctions from Pyrford onto the Old Woking Road are congested at rush hour and will not cope with an increase more cars. Pyrford and West Byfleet will become gridlocked.	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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB13	All junctions from Pyrford onto the Old Woking Road are congested at rush hour and will not cope with an increase more cars. Pyrford and West Byfleet will become gridlocked.	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 traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment 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
						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	
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB12	I object and raise serious concerns about the impact to the Pyrford area and infrastructure. I was drawn here by the country feel. The plans will have a significant environmental impact on the area. The road outside the school is already difficult to cross, additional vehicles will worsen the situation worse, endangering children/parents.	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
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB13	I object and raise serious concerns about the impact to the Pyrford area and infrastructure. I was drawn here by the country feel. The plans will have a significant environmental impact on the area. The road outside the school is already difficult to cross, additional vehicles will worsen the situation worse, endangering children/parents.	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
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB12	Other than financial gain for the Council, the proposal makes no sense and no definable benefit to Pyrford residents. There will be increased pressure on already fragile infrastructure.	None stated.	Infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocation is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Council does not benefit financially for preparing the site allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1111	Ben	Cuttle	GB13	Other than financial gain for the Council, the proposal makes no sense and no definable benefit to Pyrford residents. There will be increased pressure on already fragile infrastructure.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council does not benefit financially for preparing the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	The junctions from Pyrford onto the Old Woking Rd are congested in the morning/afternoon. The infrastructure can not cope with an increase in cars, there will be gridlock.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						As part of Transport 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.	
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	The junctions from Pyrford onto the Old Woking Rd are congested in the morning/afternoon. The infrastructure can not cope with an increase in cars, there will be gridlock.	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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	I object and raise serious concerns around the impact to the local area and infrastructure. I was drawn here by the country feel. The plans will have significant environmental impact and change this forever.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	I object and raise serious concerns around the impact to the local area and infrastructure. I was drawn here by the country feel. The plans will have significant environmental impact and change this forever.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	Other than financial gain for the Council and the landowner, the proposal makes no sense. There is no definable benefit to Pyrford residents, only increased pressure on already fragile infrastructure.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	Other than financial gain for the Council and the landowner, the proposal makes no sense. There is no definable benefit to Pyrford residents, only increased pressure on already fragile infrastructure.	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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	Many new residents would also be commuters. The stations are already congested. Will the Council be working with South West trains to address this problem and lack of parking for commuters (I suspect not).	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 service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	Many new residents would also be commuters. The stations are already congested. Will the Council be working with South West trains to address this problem and lack of parking for commuters (I suspect not).	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 service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	The road outside Pyrford Primary is already a nightmare to cross safely. Additional cars place further risk on children/parents.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	The road outside Pyrford Primary is already a nightmare to cross safely. Additional cars place further risk on children/parents.	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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB12	The school is oversubscribed, this will put more pressure on school places.	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
1113	Jenny	Cuttle	GB13	The school is oversubscribed, this will put more pressure on school places.	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
1293	Jane	Cuva	GB11	The road in the area are inadequate and can be dangerous. These have knock on effects down the line. An increase in traffic as a result of development proposals will exacerbate problems.	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 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 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
1293	Jane	Cuva	GB11	Putting forward proposals on GB will adversely affect valued landscapes in Mayford and Hook Heath. It is unacceptable to allow development on sites that are a local amenity and consist of precious wildlife habitats. These sites add to the desirability of Woking.	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1293	Jane	Cuva	GB11	GB should be protected from any development	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
1293	Jane	Cuva	GB11	Object to proposals One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	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