

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
635	Sally	Dabner	GB4	Believes that air pollution in the area is way over permitted levels, and problems with flooding should be sorted out before development.	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high and at times exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also 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. With regard to flooding, please refer to Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
635	Sally	Dabner	GB5	There are no exceptional circumstances to use the Green Belt in Byfleet.	There are no exceptional circumstances to use the Green Belt in Byfleet.	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
635	Sally	Dabner	GB4	Do not use Green Belt land for housing as there are no exceptional circumstances.	Do not use Green Belt land for housing as there are no exceptional circumstances.	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
635	Sally	Dabner	GB5	Housing in this area will put undue strain on existing infrastructure, particularly with regard to traffic and road safety.	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
635	Sally	Dabner	GB4	The site should not be used for housing as it will add to the already overcrowded village. Byfleet does not have enough infrastructure to support more housing, in terms of traffic, health facilities and schools. These issues should be sorted out before development.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, the timing of infrastructure delivery is outlined in the Council's Core Strategy, CS16. With regard to 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
1144	Chris	Daly	GB15	I object to building on Green Belt land in both Pyrford and West Byfleet. There should be sufficient brown belt land to fulfil the requirements.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1144	Chris	Daly	GB16	I object to building on Green Belt land in both Pyrford and West Byfleet. There should be sufficient brown belt land to fulfil the requirements.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1144	Chris	Daly	GB12	I object to building on Green Belt land in both Pyrford and West Byfleet. There should be sufficient brown belt land to fulfil the requirements.	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 brownfield land in the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1144	Chris	Daly	GB13	I object to building on Green Belt land in both Pyrford and West Byfleet. There should be sufficient brown belt land to fulfil the requirements.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB12	Development would combine Pyrford with Woking and obliterate the separateness of the existing community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 15.0. The proposed allocations in Pyrford would not reduce the separateness of Pyrford as they are located on the outer (southern) edge of Pyrford. The north and western sides of Pyrford are already joined to West Byfleet, and the proposals do not affect this. It should also be noted that the lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study, and would be maintained through existing policies on Design, and Lancape and Townscape (Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, and the Design SPD) and the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB13	Development would combine Pyrford with Woking and obliterate the separateness of the existing community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 15.0. The proposed allocations in Pyrford would not reduce the separateness of Pyrford as they are located on the outer (southern) edge of Pyrford. The north and western sides of Pyrford are already joined to West Byfleet, and the proposals do not affect this. It should also be noted that the lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study, and would be maintained through existing policies on Design, and Lancape and Townscape (Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, and the Design SPD) and the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB12	Objects to housing development proposals, especially those encroaching on Green Belt land in Pyrford. The council has fail to take account of and arbitrarily rejected site representations made by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB13	Objects to housing development proposals, especially those encroaching on Green Belt land in Pyrford. The council has fail to take account of and arbitrarily rejected site representations made by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB12	Development and the necessary infrastructure would change the character of the village and add to already dangerous road congestion.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB13	Development and the necessary infrastructure would change the character of the village and add to already dangerous road congestion.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB12	We are not NIMBY's and appreciate there must be an increase in housing stock, but this is not the right way to do it and local voices must be heard.	None stated.	Comment noted. All representations will be considered as part of this consultation, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant planning regulations. In addition, please see Section 6.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB13	We are not NIMBY's and appreciate there must be an increase in housing stock, but this is not the right way to do it and local voices must be heard.	None stated.	Comment noted. All representations will be considered as part of this consultation, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant planning regulations. In addition, please see Section 6.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB12	Alongside enlargement of Pyrford school to account for existing pupil numbers, there would be a need for substantial additional changes to local infrastructure, including new roads, water, sewage and shops.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11. Any need for additional shopping facilities to support an increased population would come forward through the market and considered with regard to the Council's Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1384	T.P.	Daly	GB13	Alongside enlargement of Pyrford school to account for existing pupil numbers, there would be a need for substantial additional changes to local infrastructure, including new roads, water, sewage and shops.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11. Any need for additional shopping facilities to support an increased population would come forward through the market and considered with regard to the Council's Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford and safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford, safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park, which for many people it already is.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park, which for many people it already is.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open	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
					space; a natural country park.		
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB10	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1522	J.V.	Dance	GB11	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
267	Angela	D'Andrea	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
267	Angela	D'Andrea	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
267	Angela	D'Andrea	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
267	Angela	D'Andrea	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
267	Angela	D'Andrea	GB8	Concerned about loss of green field 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
267	Angela	D'Andrea	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
267	Angela	D'Andrea	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.  The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB8	Concerned that further development in Mayford would result in an estate style development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB9	Concerned that further development in Mayford would result in an estate style development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. 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
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB8	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	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. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine 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
				Society also represents my views.		overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
27	Katherine	d'Apice	GB9	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.	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. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1416	Guy	Darby	General	Woking Youth Council feedback (several individual responses included): Considers the plan responsible due to how little Green belt land is being used balanced with the need for new homes. Woking is the victim of its own success and popularity. There is more revenue from selling homes built on the Green Belt than on urban areas, if there is demolition and clean up involved so the Green Belt aspect of the plan is sustainable and warranted. The only drawback will be the need for houses in future, and where the Green Belt boundary will then be drawn.	None stated.	Comment welcomed. 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
1416	Guy	Darby	General	The large amount of land allocated for building warehouses, while a comparatively small amount, is the most fallible aspect of the plan, despite recognising economic benefits of such development. These sites should be prioritised for housing and community services, given finite greenfield and brownfield sites.	None stated.	It should be noted that there is need for warehousing floorspace, as one of a number of development requirements in the Borough. There is a need to balance housing with the economic vitality of the Borough, as part of the Council's economic strategy. There is further detail in the Introduction and Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, and in the Council's adopted Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1416	Guy	Darby	General	Woking Youth Council feedback (several individual responses included): Feels that limiting Green Belt land taken for development achieves a balance of preserving Green belt for the good of the environment, and for community benefit. Arguably, developing Green Belt is essential economically and inevitable in terms of the need to ameliorate the housing crisis, as restrictive planning permission can constrict housing supply and drives up prices.	None stated.	Comment welcomed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1416	Guy	Darby	General	Woking Youth Council feedback (several individual responses included): Positive about the proposed plans as environmental impacts are very much outweighed by the social and environmental benefits of the development.	None stated.	Comment welcomed. More detail on this can be found in Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1416	Guy	Darby	General	Woking Youth Council feedback (several individual responses included): Sees Woking's development as positive and states that Woking can't develop without taking Green Belt land. However, proposes a way of developing without taking Green Belt: developing previous buildings, using brownfield sites and many other options. States the Borough is lucky to have 62% Green Belt but this does not mean it should be developed. Although only 2% will be developed, what will happen by 2027? Would be need another two percent? or another ten or fifteen percent?	None stated.	Comments noted. The representation is addressed in this Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 (about the need for land after 2027) 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1416	Guy	Darby	General	Woking Youth Council feedback (several individual responses included): As new companies move to Woking bringing jobs and wealth to the town, the Council must ensure housing is built quickly, in areas of good communication links, schools and amenities (healthcare, childcare, shops and bus routes. The housing must be affordable to the average resident and financial help given to those who need it to ensure people who have grown up here, and poorer people are not priced out of the housing market. While preferring the Green Belt land was not used for development, and brownfield sites cleaned and used instead, this is the ideal and in reality some Green belt land must be sacrificed. We must fight to keep as much of the 62% Green	None stated.	The issues raised have been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 21.0. Affordable housing is a priority for the Council, and is required on all sites allocated for residential use in the draft Site Allocations DPD, in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS12 Affordable housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Belt as possible and there should be a cap (maybe 4% maximum) of the total loss of Green Belt. Councillors must be honest and open about telling us how they will use this space, and agree that without further consultation no additional Green belt is sacrificed.			
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The SA is based on inconclusive evidence e.g. re. the travel times and using Google maps to measure the ease of movement is inappropriate. Google maps is not a recognised tool by transport planners. The use of Google maps is not a satisfactory approach to determining which areas of land should be removed from the GB. The conclusions are not based on substantive evidence and therefore should not be relied on. A new, appropriate and transparent Green Belt review should be undertaken.	A new, appropriate and transparent Green Belt review should be undertaken	This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0.  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
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	Concerned that the planning application for a secondary school and a Leisure Centre being considered in advance of the policy being finalised. The application proposal appears to be contrary to policy GB8 which requires 1) that a special circumstances case be made 2) to ensure appropriate land use is established for all land referred to as parcel 20 in the GBBR .	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The objective to provide a new defensible boundary has little regard to the natural landscape/geological feature. Instead, there are many suggestions of creating new GI buffers which highlights how the creation of defensible boundaries have been properly considered.	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
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The contents of the GBBR and the consequences of its contents are such that it is essential that it is robust and therefore it should have undergone a public consultation.	None stated.	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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, Section 17.0 and Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Development will result in harmful levels of noise and disturbance.	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD notes the sites proximity to the railway line and requires that proposals be accompanied with a Noise Impact Assessment.  Nevertheless, 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 light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	There is no evidenced justification for the proposed changes to the GB. The existing GBBR is inappropriate. Proposals are contrary to the NPPF and needs redoing. It should be undertaken in an open and transparent way and consulted on.	Undertake a new GBBR and ensure public consultation on the document.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 10.0 and Section 17.0  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
1298	Jean	Dare	GB11	The policy requirements are reviewed and comments are made on individual bullet points. The comments highlight multiple points in the policy/proposal where the wording is unclear or where there is a conflict with other policies.  Taking into account all the points made, GB11 should be deleted from further consideration	Review and address each of the comments made.  GB11 should be deleted from further	To clarify, the proposed site allocations set out the principle of development on these sites and contain with a list/criteria of key requirements that should be addressed in bringing the site forward. They are not intended to repeat existing policies, nor is the criteria an exhaustive list of requirements, this would make the proposal unnecessarily long. The key requirements are supported by Development Plan policies that include comprehensive and robust policies and guidance to make sure that the development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to the surrounding area. These should be read in conjunction with the Site Allocation DPD.  The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the	Review the proposal text of the proposed site allocations to ensure clarity and consistency.



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					consideration	development of the site are sustainable.  Nevertheless the Council will ensure it reviews the proposal text of its proposed site allocations to ensure clarity and consistency.	
1298	Jean	Dare	General	It is stated on the Council's website that: "The Council has not made any decision about how it wishes to take forward the recommendations of the report. It will do so as part of the Site Allocations DPD process."  However this is not true, the Site Allocation DPD and SA draws heavily from the GBBR. It is therefore surprising that the GBBR is not included in the consultation of the Site Allocation DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0  The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB14	The policy requirements are reviewed and comments are made on individual bullet points. The comments highlight multiple points in the policy/proposal where the wording is unclear, where there are grammatical errors, and where there is a conflict with other policies.	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 19.0 and 23.0. Many of the points raised will be dealt with at the detailed application stage, the purpose of the Site Allocation DPD is to establish the principle of development of the site. The key requirements set out a list of key issues that need to be addressed in bringing the site forward, the requirements are supported by a robust policy framework including Core Strategy policies CS7, CS21, CS24, emerging Development Management Policies, a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. It is important to note that development proposals will also have to take into account adopted Neighbourhood Plan policies. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. During the preparation of the 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. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	The proposal for GB9 will result in unacceptable living conditions for residents, with regards It would place undue harm highway safety.  Policy GB9 does not provide for sustainable development and should be deleted.	None stated.	The proposed allocation would establish the principle and key requirements that need to be met for the site to come forward for development. How the key requirements are demonstrated and addressed will be detailed in the planning application stage.  The Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and general amenity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	It is not possible for GB10 to provide the quantity of development proposed in a way that can provide for appropriate wildlife corridors	None stated.	The Council will encourage 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.  The key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD requires biodiversity improvements including the incorporation of wildlife features/corridors. The Council is confident that through the careful design of the site, taking into account other Development Plan policies and relevant guidance (including Core Strategy Policy CS21, the Design SPD and Natural Woking), that these measures can be successfully incorporated.  In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	Concerned that WBC seek to remove GB land based on the flawed GBBR. The Site Allocation DPD and it Sustainability	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	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
				Appraisal draw from the conclusions of the GBBR. The GBBR lacks credibility and its conclusions are not supported by a Lancape Character Study which is fundamental to the judgements being made.			of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy Inspectors required a GBBR to be undertaken, however, it is considered that the GBBR should have been undertaken in an open and transparent basis. It should also be thorough and based on a robust methodology.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.7 and Section 10.0.  The Council is satisfied that the methodology is robust, logical, coherent, and comprehensive to form the basis of the review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	Weight is given to the presence of a local centre however the SA fails to take into account the size and facilities in the centres and the relative size of the site parcels.	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.  Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	Concern raised that parcel 20 (comprising of GB8,9,10,11,14) has been unfairly singled out (see para 3.2.10). The reason for its identification has been stated as being 1) its close relationship to existing development 2) it comprises a variable character that is not entirely rural. These reasons would apply to all of the GB land being considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 in particular paragraphs 10.3-10.4 and Section 17.0.  It is important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	Concern raised that parcel 20 (comprising of GB8,9,10,11,14) has been unfairly singled out (see para 3.2.10). The reason for its identification has been stated as being 1) its close relationship to existing development 2) it comprises a variable character that is not entirely rural. These reasons would apply to all of the GB land being considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 in particular paragraphs 10.3-10.4 and Section 17.0.  It is important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Concern raised that parcel 20 (comprising of GB8,9,10,11,14) has been unfairly singled out (see para 3.2.10). The reason for its identification has been stated as being 1) its close relationship to existing development 2) it comprises a variable character that is not entirely rural. These reasons would apply to all of the GB land being considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 in particular paragraphs 10.3-10.4 and Section 17.0. It is important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB11	Concern raised that parcel 20 (comprising of GB8,9,10,11,14) has been unfairly singled out (see para 3.2.10). The reason for its identification has been stated as	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 in particular paragraphs 10.3-10.4 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
				being 1) its close relationship to existing development 2) it comprises a variable character that is not entirely rural. These reasons would apply to all of the GB land being considered.		It is important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	
1298	Jean	Dare	GB14	Concern raised that parcel 20 (comprising of GB8,9,10,11,14) has been unfairly singled out (see para 3.2.10). The reason for its identification has been stated as being 1) its close relationship to existing development 2) it comprises a variable character that is not entirely rural. These reasons would apply to all of the GB land being considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 in particular paragraphs 10.3-10.4 and Section 17.0.  It is important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	The impact on heritage assets is important and the reference to the need to 'pay regard' to heritage assets does not carry the sufficient weight and it contrary to the NPPF.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the policy wording could be improved to clarify that it should be in accordance to CS20.	Amend the key requirement:  Design of the development to have regard to heritage asset and setting in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS20-Grade II Listed Building to south east of the site
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	The policy requirements are reviewed and comments are made on individual bullet points. The comments highlight multiple points in the policy/proposal where the wording is unclear or where there is a conflict with other policies.  Taking into account all the points made, GB10 should be deleted from further consideration	Review and address each of the comments made.  GB10 should be deleted from further consideration	To clarify, the proposed site allocations set out the principle of development on these sites and contain with a list/criteria of key requirements that should be addressed in bringing the site forward. They are not intended to repeat existing policies, nor is the criteria an exhaustive list of requirements, this would make the proposal unnecessarily long. The key requirements are supported by Development Plan policies that include comprehensive and robust policies and guidance to make sure that the development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to the surrounding area. These should be read in conjunction with the Site Allocation DPD.  The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site are sustainable.  Nevertheless the Council will ensure it reviews the proposal text of its proposed site allocations to ensure clarity and consistency.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB11	National policy requires convincing justification for the harm or loss to heritage assets. Development proposals will cause substantial harm to the Conservation Area and Grade II listed building.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	Concern raised about the existing local business on the site and the process of relocating these uses and whether it is viable to do so.	None stated.	The reference to local business is a factual statement that the existing uses on the site (the garden centre), will need to be relocated for development to come forward on the site. The garden centre is not defined as a community facility and it is not a commercial use located within a defined Centre, therefore it is not afforded the same protection. i.e. there is no requirement to ensure the use is retained or relocated. Nevertheless the Council will plan positively to support the needs of businesses in line with CS15, and work with its partners to ensure sustainable economic growth in the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	Concern raised about the existing local business on the site and the process of relocating these uses and whether it is viable to do so.	None stated.	The reference to local business is a factual statement that the existing uses on the site (the garden centre), will need to be relocated for development to come forward on the site. The garden centre is not defined as a community facility and it is not a commercial use located within a defined Centre, therefore it is not afforded the same protection. i.e. there is no requirement to ensure the use is retained or relocated.  Nevertheless the Council will plan positively to support the needs of businesses in line with CS15, and work with its partners to ensure sustainable economic growth in the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	HHNP policy OS1 seeks to retain and where possible enhance open spaces. Proposals that would result in harm to open space and clearly defined views would be contrary to the policy.	A new GBBR should be undertaken	The representation is incorrect. The Council has an extensive, robust evidence base which supports the identification of the site in the draft Site Allocation DPD. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 8.0, 10.0, 17.0 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
				<p>There is no reference to policy OS1 in the Site Allocation DPD. The Site Allocations DPD cannot simply sweep aside the views of the local community, as appropriately expressed through the national planning system.</p> <p>A new GBBR should be undertaken</p>		<p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policies CS17, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. Therefore the essence of Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan policy OS1 has been considered, albeit at a strategic level.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	
1298	Jean	Dare	General	<p>Policy CS24 is disregarded on the basis that "this local designation is not substantiated." It is completely inappropriate for the authors to ignore the adopted policy. Comments made about the Escarpment are unjustified as there is no Lancape Character Assessment to support the conclusions.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt Boundary Review assessed the parcel's Lancape sensitivity and capacity for change. The assessment confirmed that there were parts of the Escarpment that were steeply sloping and prominent, where these would be sensitive to development in lancape and visual terms, however it also found that parts of site were either level or shallow sloping that could accommodate some development. However, any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Lancape and Townscape.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	<p>The planting of trees will not enhance the sense of separation of the settlements if a school and housing are to be built on the sites.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	<p>The planting of trees will not enhance the sense of separation of the settlements if a school and housing are to be built on the sites.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	<p>The methodology in the report includes a sieve mapping stage. This stage removes sites containing absolute constraints, including Common Land, Conservation Areas. However parcel 20 contains both of these. The example demonstrates the inconsistent approach that has been applied. Given this fundamental error at early stage the rest of the report can not be relied upon. A robust methodology would be consistent otherwise it is not clear how sites have been considered in a robust manner. The only solution is to undertake a robust GBBR which goes through early consultation.</p>	None stated.	<p>This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB14	<p>GB14 should be deleted. The proposal to remove GB14 from the GB to designate as GI is bizarre and nonsensical. Land within the GB already comprises outdoor sport and recreation. If the site is intended for future use as open space and leisure then there is no need for its removal. The policy states that it is unsuitable for development as it is situated on a high point of the escarpment, it is therefore perverse of the Council to remove it from the GB.</p>	None stated.	<p>The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. 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
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	<p>GB8 and GB9 perform an important GB function of maintaining separation of the settlements, creating a visual break and maintaining openness. These functions can not be achieved if development proceeds on these sites.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	<p>GB8 and GB9 perform an important GB function of maintaining separation of the settlements, creating a visual break and maintaining openness. These functions can not be achieved if development proceeds on these sites.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	<p>The GBBR is not a robust evidence base and should not be relied upon</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. The Council had been concerned to ensure that the review is founded on a robust and credible methodology. In this regard, the consultants who carried out the study published the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review for stakeholder consultation to make sure that all technical aspects of how to carry out a Green Belt boundary review would be covered. Therefore the Council is satisfied that the methodology is robust, logical, coherent, and comprehensive to form the basis of the review.</p>	No further modification is 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 important to note that the GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD.	
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The 'preliminary assessment' of lancape is a lightweight, subjective overview. It lacks credibility. The assessments are based on pre-determined parcels where the lancape character differs within them. The quality of the assessment is reflected in table 3.12 of the report, which contains brief, sweeping and subjective statements	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 in particular paragraph 7.1 and 7.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The argument for retaining and the removal of land from the GB are often the same which makes the arguments confusing and fundamentally flawed. The arguments are inconsistent. For example, It is advised that proposals should maintain the openness of the GB when development will effectively do the opposite. It is advised that the separation between Woking and Mayford should be maintained through the masterplanning process when the proposals are effectively removing the gap between the settlements.	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. The Council is satisfied that that the DPD is adequately and appropriately informed by robust and up-to-date evidence base ( the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0 and 10.0) , and a Sustainability Appraisal. The sites identified are supported by a robust evidence base including a Green Belt Boundary Review. The proposed site allocations also include a list of key requirements that need to be met for sites to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements make sure that the development of the site are sustainable compared against the reasonable alternatives.Please also see the Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The GBBR acknowledges lancape character as a key consideration in identifying sites however it is noted that WBC does not have a detailed lancape character assessment to inform the GBBR. This is not considered robust.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	<p>A timeline of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP) preparation is outlined. It is argued that HHNP had submitted the plan and undergone an Examination by the end of the Site Allocation DPD consultation (Note: HHNP has since been adopted).</p> <p>The rep stresses the need to attach material planning weight to the HHNP. If progressed as proposed, the Site Allocations DPD would result in planning applications being determined on a basis that would be in conflict with, and which would fail to take account of, the development plan as it will apply in Hook Heath. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>The policies of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan cannot be ignored by Woking Borough Council – and must be taken into account during the preparation of new policies.</p> <p>It is also noted that the GBBR has not taken HHNP into consideration. Therefore, as the Site Allocation DPD draws from the GBBR, it directly conflicts with the HHNP</p> <p>It is considered that HHNP policies are relevant when considering matters relating to local character.</p> <p>It is considered that this error must have been an oversight, otherwise it would demonstrate deliberate contempt to the community or general incompetence.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council worked with the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum in preparing their Neighbourhood Plan and is aware that the Plan was adopted in October 2015.</p> <p>The Council did not ignore the Neighbourhood Plan, however the timescales in finalising the draft Development Plan Document and Neighbourhood Plan may have overlapped. The Council is not of the view that there is anything fundamentally at od between the contents of the Site Allocation DPD and the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Indeed, a Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the Council's development plan documents, plans and strategies and should not prevent development.</p> <p>The Green Belt Boundary Review is an extensive piece of technical, evidence base document, that was carried in prior to the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum being established and published shortly afterward. It is incorrect and unreasonable to suggest that the Green Belt Boundary Review should have pre-empted the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and somehow taken into account of it, particularly as the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan was published nearly two years after the Green Belt Boundary Review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	Object to the Site Allocation DPD. The DPD relies on the conclusions of the GBBR, which is flawed and therefore inappropriate. It is likely that it would be open to legal challenge if progressed in its current form.	None stated.	<p>This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The Council will publish a statement of legal and procedural requirements and the tests of soundness in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of Statement to demonstrate it has met the requirements in the preparation of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The NPPF sets out the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Although acknowledge the requirement set out by CS inspector. Attention is also drawn to the Parliamentary Briefing Paper	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				00934, 30 June 2015)			
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The GBBR has been carried out on the basis of a 'preliminary assessment' of landscape characteristics. It is acknowledged in the review that the 'preliminary assessment' is a strategic overview. The 'preliminary assessment' carries no material weight whatsoever.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 in particular paragraph 7.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	The argument put forward in support of a school on Parcel 20 are subjective and unsubstantiated. How can the building of a secondary school maintain the openness of the GB?	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 issues of 'openness' was addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report (paragraph 20- 23) for the application. Available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	Policies GB8-GB11, GB14 contain inappropriate wording and therefore are not capable of being implemented.	None stated.	The Council is not aware of any inappropriate wording.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	Policies GB8-GB11, GB14 contain inappropriate wording and therefore are not capable of being implemented.	None stated.	The Council is not aware of any inappropriate wording.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Policies GB8-GB11, GB14 contain inappropriate wording and therefore are not capable of being implemented.	None stated.	The Council is not aware of any inappropriate wording.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB11	Policies GB8-GB11, GB14 contain inappropriate wording and therefore are not capable of being implemented.	None stated.	The Council is not aware of any inappropriate wording.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB14	Policies GB8-GB11, GB14 contain inappropriate wording and therefore are not capable of being implemented.	None stated.	The Council is not aware of any inappropriate wording.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The Site Allocation DPD fails to comply with up to date planning policy including policies contained within HHNP, which carries significant weight but has been completely ignored.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan became part of the Development Plan in October 2015, this is after the regulation 18 consultation of the Site Allocation DPD (see Section 6.0 the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper).  Nevertheless, the Council does not consider there to be any conflicts between the Site Allocation DPD and the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The Site Allocation DPD suggests that there are significant areas of land (140 ha with capacity of 1681 dwellings) that can be removed from the GB. This is treble the requirement needed. Over 100 ha of GB post 2027 is not required and not justified.  The suggestion of the removal of 140 ha of GB when only 46 ha is needed exemplifies how inappropriate proposals are. It signals the lack of understanding and purpose of GB policy as set out in the NPPF.	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
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The Core Strategy commits to 550 new dwellings in the GB between 2022-2027. It was recognised that the Core Strategy could delivered "without undermining the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt". There was no suggestion of any further development beyond the end of the plan period.	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
1298	Jean	Dare	General	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB8	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1298	Jean	Dare	GB9	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB11	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB14	Object to the removal of GB sites in Hook Heath due to the lack of substantive evidence to warrant removing the sites from the GB. The GBBR is inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	General	The weighting system is unclear e.g. the identification of major environmental constraints does not lead to the site being excluded from consideration.	None stated.	The Council is confident that the SA is robust and has consistently assessed sites against the numerous sustainability objectives. A comprehensive explanation has been included for each objective to explain the scoring.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	The possibility of contaminated land severely restricts its ability to deliver residential development.	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD notes historic contaminative uses that may lead to soil and ground water contamination and requires further investigation and remediation measures where necessary.  Nevertheless, proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies and relevant guidance. Including Core Strategy Policy CS9, CS21 and emerging Development Management Policies DM8 that require new development be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Reference to an equalisation agreement should not be in the policy. It implies that the policy has been influenced by landowner/developers.	Reference to an equalisation agreement should be removed	Due to the need to provide a better integration of green infrastructure to maintain the rural character of the area the evidence provided in the Green Belt boundary review has emphasised the need for GB14 to be planned as a green infrastructure site to serve sites GB8, GB10 and GB11. Consequently the way these sites, which has different land ownership, plan to integrate and make accessible this necessary infrastructure an equalisation agreement and or any other means of arrangement that will ensure effective integration and access to this infrastructure will be required.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1298	Jean	Dare	GB10	Reference is made to the developer's transport assessment and the requirement of 3 access points. This is inappropriate. It should be made clear what statements have been derived from developer/landowner's evidence	None stated.	The Council accepts that the bullet point is informative rather than setting out a key requirement. The point is also considered to be repetitive of other points. It should therefore be deleted.  The exact nature of highway measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	The bullet point 'The developer's transport assessment...' should be deleted.
688	Vikram	Das	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
688	Vikram	Das	GB10	Worplesdon Station does not have enough parking spaces for a significant increase of commuters. The approach to the station is too narrow and already causes delays.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide 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. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP. 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimised. In summing up for his consideration of infrastructure matters at the Core Strategy Examination, the Inspector concluded that the Core Strategy addresses adequately the provision of infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy.	
688	Vikram	Das	GB11	Worplesdon Station does not have enough parking spaces for a significant increase of commuters. The approach to the station is too narrow and already causes delays.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide 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. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP. 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 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. In summing up for his consideration of infrastructure matters at the Core Strategy Examination, the Inspector concluded that the Core Strategy addresses adequately the provision of infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB14	Worplesdon Station does not have enough parking spaces for a significant increase of commuters. The approach to the station is too narrow and already causes delays.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide 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. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP. 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 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. In summing up for his consideration of infrastructure matters at the Core Strategy Examination, the Inspector concluded that the Core Strategy addresses adequately the provision of infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
688	Vikram	Das	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable impacts on visual amenity and local character. 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.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic 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
688	Vikram	Das	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
688	Vikram	Das	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
688	Vikram	Das	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	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
688	Vikram	Das	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 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	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 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB14	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 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
688	Vikram	Das	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
688	Vikram	Das	GB14	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
169	Roy	Davey	GB12	Write on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Pyrford CE Primary Academy School to register concern for the effect proposed housing on local infrastructure, particularly on local primary education places. The Education Funding Agency, through their preferred contractor Yorkon, will be making a planning application in August 2015 to build a new school on the present site. This school will be within the present footprint and will not exceed its present two form entry and staffing levels. Primary and secondary school places in Surrey are expected to expand before 2027. Should this be the case. Surrey CC will need to consider further provision in the local area. This school's directors are not considering further expansion.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The County Council has confirmed that the educational needs to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
169	Roy	Davey	GB13	Write on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Pyrford CE Primary Academy School to register concern for the effect proposed housing on local infrastructure, particularly on local primary education places. The Education Funding Agency, through their preferred contractor Yorkon, will be making a planning application in August 2015 to build a new school on the present site. This school will be within the present footprint and will not exceed its present two form entry and staffing levels. Primary and secondary school places in Surrey are expected to expand before 2027. Should this be the case. Surrey CC will need to consider further provision in the local area. This school's directors are not considering further expansion.	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 also comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can be developed without unacceptable and/or unmitigated impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
169	Roy	Davey	GB12	Building 423 houses will generate, a need for over 100 new school places. Pyrford Academy received over 234 applications for reception places in 2015 for 60 places. The newly built school could not meet expectations for new school places. Ask the Borough to consult with Surrey CC and ensure part of the Community Infrastructure Levy will finance appropriate developments at the school, for additional school places and an appropriate road plan for access the school.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The County Council has confirmed that the educational needs to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
169	Roy	Davey	GB13	Building 423 houses will generate, a need for over 100 new school places. Pyrford Academy received over 234 applications for reception places in 2015 for 60 places. The	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. The Council has already identified education provision as one of the infrastructure that the Community Infrastructure Levy will be used to deliver.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				newly built school could not meet expectations for new school places. Ask the Borough to consult with Surrey CC and ensure part of the Community Infrastructure Levy will finance appropriate developments at the school, for additional school places and an appropriate road plan for access the school.			
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB12	Ask you to reconsider and meet with all of us to hear our objections and voice your ideas. The houses built will be smaller and won't fit in. There is not much land/or space for more houses or families. More money will be needed for keeping roads safe, more doctors and more schools. Please don't ruin the village.	None stated.	Officers are always willing to meet with local residents to hear their views and had done so prior to and during the Regulation 18 consultation of the DPD. A meeting will be accepted if requested. The Council will ensure that the development proposals are supported by necessary infrastructure to enable development to be sustainable. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB13	Ask you to reconsider and meet with all of us to hear our objections and voice your ideas. The houses built will be smaller and won't fit in. There is not much land/or space for more houses or families. More money will be needed for keeping roads safe, more doctors and more schools. Please don't ruin the village.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. Overall, the development will be sustainable as it is expected to be supported by necessary infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB12	We chose to live in a peaceful village. This will all be destroyed once the new houses are built, ruining the idyllic childhood village I grew up in. If hundreds more families move here this will ruin our community. We have beautiful scenery, a local school full of respectable children and a loving church. Development would take away the small greenery Pyrford has and cause families choosing to move here to go somewhere else.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. 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
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB13	We chose to live in a peaceful village. This will all be destroyed once the new houses are built, ruining the idyllic childhood village I grew up in. If hundreds more families move here this will ruin our community. We have beautiful scenery, a local school full of respectable children and a loving church. Development would take away the small greenery Pyrford has and cause families choosing to move here to go somewhere else.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB13	Building will damage the local economy. It already takes a month to book a doctors appointment, this would worsen. Also long waiting list for schools, increased traffic causing pollution and more accidents. Local woodland and park likely to get damaged and increase in litter.	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 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	No further modification is 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 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. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1097	Ellie	Davey	GB12	Building will damage the local economy. It already takes a month to book a doctors appointment, this would worsen. Also long waiting list for schools, increased traffic causing pollution and more accidents. Local woodland and park likely to get damaged and increase in litter.	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposals will damage the local economy. Overall, the proposals in the DPD will promote economic growth and job creation. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway 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. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1104	Nita	Davey	GB12	I object to building on our lovely fiel. I moved to live in a small, beautiful community that feels safe and is close to a school and park. Development will ruin the area and break up our community. Infrastructure is already under pressure (doctors, congested roads). More cars will mean gridlock.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of lancape of the site to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support 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	No further modification is 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 needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. 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.	
1104	Nita	Davey	GB13	I object to building on our lovely fiel. I moved to live in a small, beautiful community that feels safe and is close to a school and park. Development will ruin the area and break up our community. Infrastructure is already under pressure (doctors, congested roads). More cars will mean gridlock.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of lancape of the site to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support 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 minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. 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
1104	Nita	Davey	GB12	If we had wanted to live in a built up area we would have lived in Woking. Green Belt is there to be protected and admired. Pyrford is a small village with little green land, you are planning to rip away the greenery we do have.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The	No further modification is 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 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.	
1104	Nita	Davey	GB13	If we had wanted to live in a built up area we would have lived in Woking. Green Belt is there to be protected and admired. Pyrford is a small village with little green land, you are planning to rip away the greenery we do have.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular 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
1104	Nita	Davey	GB12	Local children already can not get places at Pyrford Primary School. The school will be unable to support the massive surge of children come 2030.	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
1104	Nita	Davey	GB13	Local children already can not get places at Pyrford Primary School. The school will be unable to support the massive surge of children come 2030.	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
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB12	There would be insufficient places at the local school. People don't want these houses. We will fight to preserve our way of life and Pyrford as a separate village.	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
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB13	There would be insufficient places at the local school. People don't want these houses. We will fight to preserve our way of life and Pyrford as a separate village.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. Overall, the development will be sustainable as it is expected to be supported by necessary infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB12	The woods could be overcome with people and mess from things such as dogs.	None stated.	The Council make sure that the development is served by the necessary and justified infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB13	The woods could be overcome with people and mess from things such as dogs.	None stated.	The Council will ensure that the proposals are served with adequate green infrastructure including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB12	I have severe objections to the 400 houses to be built on our land. Our peaceful way of life will soon be destroyed. People move here to bring up their families or retire. Building will cause untold havoc. May find the park has been vandalised and littered.	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. There is no evidence to suggest that the development will lead to vandalism.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1106	Arthur	Davey	GB13	I have severe objections to the 400 houses to be built on our land. Our peaceful way of life will soon be destroyed. People move here to bring up their families or retire. Building will cause untold havoc. May find the park has been vandalised and littered.	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
1414	Clare	Davie	GB12	The Council is danger of number crunching to appease those with their min set on targets and budgets, and not on the future well being of out Green Belt, which once destroyed cannot be reclaimed. These plans cannot be justified.	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
1414	Clare	Davie	GB13	The Council is danger of number crunching to appease those with their min set on targets and budgets, and not on the future well being of out Green Belt, which once destroyed cannot be reclaimed. These plans cannot be justified.	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
1414	Clare	Davie	GB12	Appreciates the Green Belt in the village and concerned about the proposed plans. Whilst appreciating the need for new housing nationally, this is a disproportionate number of houses and associated infrastructure, that will be hugely detrimental to the area.	None stated.	Comment noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 3.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1414	Clare	Davie	GB13	Appreciates the Green Belt in the village and concerned about the proposed plans. Whilst appreciating the need for new housing nationally, this is a disproportionate number of houses and associated infrastructure, that will be hugely detrimental to the area.	None stated.	Comment noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 3.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	Objects to the proposal to increase travellers pitches on this land. Woking's traveller sites are concentrated in this area and nearby surrounding areas, so Mayford already makes a major contribution. Further expansion at this site is not justified.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.	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 grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites. Sites in the urban area should be considered before the Green Belt. As no urban sites have been considered this creates doubt that there are no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable is valid.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to the edge of the urban area with good access to jobs, infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	The Green Belt Review had an inconsistent approach, identifying areas of land not to be considered due to a number of constraints but also recommending land with these constraints. The GB Review rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The collectively justify the allocation of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB7	National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances", which hasn't been proven by the Council. According to the policy housing need does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. 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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
						projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without 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. 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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance" (Policy CS24).	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancaple as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancaple implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancaple Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancaple importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The Council carried out a lancaple character assessment, and the DPD has been appropriately informed by lancaple sensitivity assessment. This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, going against the idea of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	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 for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Green Belt 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.	
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancape Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancape importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The lancape implications of the proposals are fully taken into account.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, going against the idea of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB9	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 for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools.	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 of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				New residents would be isolated without a car.		<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. 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>	
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancape Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancape importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, going against the idea of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB10	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 for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancaple Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancaple importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The lancaple 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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, going against the idea of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.  Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
30	Katrina	Davies	GB11	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 for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Based on the evidence, in particular as set out in Sections 3, 7, 12, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. In addition, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Strongly object to proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Mayford Village Society was advised the Sporting Facilities of the school would be an asset to residents as they would be available when the school was not using them. This is a common feature at many schools in the Borough. They were not told of the extensive out of hours operation and use of the associated Leisure Centre.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Justification for the 8 lane running track and Leisure Centre is part of the re-generation of Sheerwater facilities that have been removed there for housing and need to be replaced. While I accept the running track may need to be re-located, the proposed Leisure Centre on Egley Road does not replace similar facilities at Sheerwater. These are new and do not justify "Special Circumstances".	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Site GB8 has been identified for its suitability to enable the development of a school and new homes. The Leisure Centre and the recreational uses on the site already has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	Leisure Centre and running track will be used all day twice a year by up to 500 participants with School and Community usage by 30 - 500 participants, plus competitions and championships, 10 events a year, mainly Spring and Summer weekends, 150 - 1000 per event building to 18 per year 150 - 2000 per event. Noise level at weekends will have a huge impact on all of Mayford, Saunders Lane, Saunders Copse and Hook Hill Lane, particularly when the prevailing	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre now has 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
				wind is in this direction. If the Public Address System is as loud as Woking Football Club this will be audible on Saunders Lane, Saunders Copse, throughout the Village. Egley Road residents will suffer every day, weekday, evenings and weekends with School and Leisure Centre, plus all the Athletics attendances with no respite.			
30	Katrina	Davies	GB8	We are facing a Commercial Leisure Centre to be tacked onto the school, to avoid submitting a separate planning application. 1,500 attendances results with up to 10,000 additional traffic movements, it is hard to justify with another Leisure Centre at Woking Park less than two miles away. The increase in air pollution is a major issue for residents, particularly those with asthma. Most concerned about the impact of noise, pollution and traffic out of school hours, particularly at weekends. The benefits to the Local Community of having access to the Leisure Centre does not outweigh the inconvenience to residents during out of hours operations.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre proposal now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha.</p> <p>The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	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
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	The likelihood of increased crime as a result of development proposals is an unknown factor. However all development proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy. The policy requires that proposals meet the criteria set out, including to create safe and secure environments, where opportunities for crime are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	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
253	Linda	Davies	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fiel and lancape 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
253	Linda	Davies	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
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.  The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
253	Linda	Davies	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
499	Andrea	Davies	GB12	Highlights the attraction of Pyrford village as a pleasant place and environment in which to live: closeknit community, a wonderful school, green fiel and roads safe for cycling as a family.	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 23.0. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This means that there is potential for cycling to improve as a result of development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
499	Andrea	Davies	GB13	Highlights the attraction of Pyrford village as a pleasant place and environment in which to live: closeknit community, a wonderful school, green fiel and roads safe for cycling as a family.	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 23.0. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This means that there is potential for cycling to improve as a result of development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
499	Andrea	Davies	GB12	Appreciates the green surroundings, which we fear we are in danger of losing. Hopes the Council will take these concerns into serious consideration as it faces the challenge of	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	No further modification is 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 shortages. Pyrford will be spoilt forever if development of this scale takes place.		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 proposed number of houses on the site are based on the indicative densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS10. The exact number of dwellings and the proposed densities will only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. Generally, fewer dwellings on this site or lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need of the Borough.	
499	Andrea	Davies	GB13	Appreciates the green surroundings, which we fear we are in danger of losing. Hopes the Council will take these concerns into serious consideration as the Council face the challenge of housing shortages. Pyrford will be spoilt forever if development of this scale takes place.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The proposed number of houses on the site are based on the indicative densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS10. The exact number of dwellings and the proposed densities will only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. Generally, fewer dwellings on this site or lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need of the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
499	Andrea	Davies	GB12	Registers deep concern and objection at the proposals for Pyrford to lose a significant amount of Green Belt to allow development of hundreds of new houses.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The Council believes that the proposed site is suitable for future development needs post 2027. This is set out in detail in the Sustainability Appraisal. 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 principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
499	Andrea	Davies	GB13	Registers deep concern and objection at the proposals for Pyrford to lose a significant amount of Green Belt to allow development of hundreds of new houses.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The Council believes that the proposed site is suitable for future development needs post 2027. This is set out in detail in the Sustainability Appraisal. 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 principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
510	Mark	Davies	GB12	Secondly, there are significant planning restrictions in the area as it is a beautiful area steeped in history and supporting numerous indigenous wildlife. It would be a crime to destroy this environment when there are significant urbanised areas around Woking that could be redeveloped instead. Please help us protect this beautiful part of the Woking area.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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). Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 9.0, 11.0 and 21.0.</p>	
510	Mark	Davies	GB13	There are significant planning restrictions in the area as it is a beautiful area steeped in history and supporting numerous indigenous wildlife. It would be a crime to destroy this environment when there are significant urbanised areas around Woking that could be redeveloped instead. Please help us protect this beautiful part of the Woking area.	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 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). Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 9.0, 11.0 and 21.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
510	Mark	Davies	GB12	While fully understanding the need to provide additional housing, alarmed at this development for two reasons. Firstly Pyrford is a village and still has a quintessentially village lifestyle (despite being less 'sleepy' than it was). The addition of 400 houses plus the necessary infrastructure will destroy Pyrford as we know it and create a town.	None stated.	<p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development, which inevitably requires a degree of change in local areas. However this can be managed to ensure adequate local infrastructure and designed to preserve local character and landscapes as far as possible. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 7.0, paragraph 7.4-7.5, and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
510	Mark	Davies	GB13	Secondly, there are significant planning restrictions in the area as it is a beautiful area steeped in history and supporting numerous indigenous wildlife. It would be a crime to destroy this environment when there are significant urbanised areas around Woking that could be redeveloped instead. Please help us protect this beautiful part of the Woking area.	None stated.	<p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development, which inevitably requires a degree of change in local areas. However this can be managed to ensure adequate local infrastructure and designed to preserve local character and landscapes as far as possible. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 7.0, paragraph 7.4-7.5, and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Mistakenly states Woking not historic - yet Mayford is mentioned in the Doomsday Book.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Mistakenly states Woking not historic - yet Mayford is mentioned in the Doomsday Book.	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 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Mistakenly states Woking not historic - yet Mayford is mentioned in the Doomsday Book.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Mistakenly states Woking not historic - yet Mayford is mentioned in the Doomsday 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.  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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Mistakenly states Woking not historic - Mayford is mentioned in the Doomsday 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.  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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	No independent evidence that all brown field 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	No independent evidence that all brown field 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	No independent evidence that all brown field 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	No independent evidence that all brown field 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	No independent evidence that brown field 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt location.	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 Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt location.	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 Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt location.	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 Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt	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:	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				location.		<p>Green Belt 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 Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt location.	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 Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	Reconsider the proposals as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Proposals are in opposition to the stated goals for Green Belt location.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Lancape Charter Assessment has not been carried out.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Lancape Charter Assessment has not been carried out.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Lancape Charter Assessment has not been carried out.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Lancape Charter Assessment has not been carried out.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Lancape Charter Assessment has not been carried out.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	Mayford is not accessible to jobs and local services.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a 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>	No further modification is 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 allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and lancape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.	
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Mayford only 5 mins away from Woking as it is.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Mayford only 5 mins away from Woking as it is.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Mayford only 5 mins away from Woking as it is.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Mayford only 5 mins away from Woking as it is.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Mayford only 5 mins away from Woking as it is.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	No justification has been given 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Ownership should not have a bearing on Green Belt decisions.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Ownership should not have a bearing on Green Belt decisions.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Ownership should not have a bearing on Green Belt decisions.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Ownership should not have a bearing on Green Belt decisions.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Ownership should have no bearing on Green Belt decisions.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	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.  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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	The risk to wildlife and protected heaths and areas of interest is unacceptable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	No urban or other sites have been considered across the entire 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Risk to flood plains have not been taken into account.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Risk to flood plains have not been taken into account.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Risk to flood plains have not been taken into account.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Risk to flood plains have not been taken into account.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Risk to flood plains have not been taken into account.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Green Belt designations should remain unless in "exceptional circumstances" - this has not been proved by the council. In a statement the Business Secretary (Sajid Javid) confirms "there is no need to build on the Green Belt". <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb">http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb</a>	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Green Belt designations should remain unless in "exceptional circumstances" - this has not been proved by the council. In a statement the Business Secretary (Sajid Javid) confirms "there is no need to build on the Green Belt". <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb">http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb</a>	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Green Belt designations should remain unless in "exceptional circumstances" - this has not been proved by the council. In a statement the Business Secretary (Sajid Javid) confirms "there is no need to build on the Green Belt". <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb">http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb</a>	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Green Belt designations should remain unless in "exceptional circumstances" - this has not been proved by the council. In a statement the Business Secretary (Sajid Javid) confirms "there is no need to build on the Green Belt". <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb">http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p02wqdb</a>	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Green Belt designations should remain unless in "exceptional circumstances" - this has not been proved by the council. In a statement the Business Secretary (Sajid Javid) confirms "there is no need to build on 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 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	SSSIs not given buffers, like SPAs have been.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	SSSIs not given buffers, like SPAs have been.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	SSSIs not given buffers, like SPAs have been.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	SSSIs not given buffers, like SPAs have been.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	SSSIs not given buffers, like SPAs have been.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Current infrastructure will not cope with expansion and no development. There are multiple single lane traffic bridges.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Current infrastructure will not cope with expansion and no development. There are multiple single lane traffic bridges.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Current infrastructure will not cope with expansion and no development. There are multiple single lane traffic bridges.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Current infrastructure will not cope with expansion and no development. There are multiple single lane traffic bridges.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Current infrastructure will not cope with expansion and no development. There are multiple single lane traffic bridges.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Green Belt review inconsistent, some factors have excluded some sites but other land included despite the same factors.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Green Belt review inconsistent, some factors have excluded some sites but other land included despite the same factors.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Green Belt review inconsistent, some factors have excluded some sites but other land included despite the same factors.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Green Belt review inconsistent, some factors have excluded some sites but other land included despite the same factors.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Green Belt review inconsistent, some factors have excluded some sites but other land included despite the same factors.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	The specific purpose for the Green Belt is to prevent the urban sprawl and the physical separation of Woking/Mayford/Guildford. The proposed plans would be destroy that.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	The specific purpose for the Green Belt is to prevent the urban sprawl and the physical separation of Woking/Mayford/Guildford. The proposed plans would be destroy that.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	The specific purpose for the Green Belt is to prevent the urban sprawl and the physical separation of Woking/Mayford/Guildford. The proposed plans would be destroy that.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	The specific purpose for the Green Belt is to prevent the urban sprawl and the physical separation of Woking/Mayford/Guildford. The proposed plans would be destroy that.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	The specific purpose for the Green Belt is to prevent the urban sprawl and the physical separation of Woking/Mayford/Guildford. The proposed plans would be destroy that.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB7	Reconsider more beneficial brownfield sites. Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
862	Paul	Davies	GB8	Moved to the areas due to its Green Belt properties. Plans will negatively impact to the locale.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB9	Moved to the areas due to its Green Belt properties. Plans will negatively impact to the locale.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB10	Moved to the areas due to its Green Belt properties. Plans will negatively impact to the locale.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB11	Moved to the areas due to its Green Belt properties. Plans will negatively impact to the locale.	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
862	Paul	Davies	GB14	Moved to the areas due to its Green Belt properties. Plans will negatively impact to the locale.	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
1366	Richard	Davion	GB12	Development of 2000+ houses at Wisley Airfield will have a significant impact on Pyrford. Can you confirm the status of this permission and expected timeframes? Is disappointed by the lack of communication from WBC on this	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. Please see 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  Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19.  Wisley Airfield is located within Guildford Borough. Please contact the relevant authority for further information.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1366	Richard	Davion	GB13	Development of 2000+ houses at Wisley Airfield will have a significant impact on Pyrford. Can you confirm the status of this permission and expected timeframes? Is disappointed by the lack of communication from WBC on this.	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. Please see 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. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. Wisley Airfield is located within Guildford Borough. Please contact the relevant authority for further information.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1366	Richard	Davion	GB12	Local resident, concerned about proposals at GB12 and GB13	None stated.	Objection 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
1366	Richard	Davion	GB13	Local resident, concerned about proposals at GB12 and GB13	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1366	Richard	Davion	GB12	The adverse impacts on utilities is well documented and WBC appear to be departing from recommendations in the GBBR. Please explain why WBC has done this and whether there is an action plan regarding infrastructure provision or cost benefit analysis on the overall impact on net social welfare?	None stated.	<p>This representation has been broadly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10. Nevertheless the Council will continue to consult with relevant utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and during the planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section10.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The site allocation is accompanied with a Sustainability Appraisal which assesses the sites against social, environmental and economic objectives to determine the overall sustainability of the site.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1366	Richard	Davion	GB13	The adverse impacts on utilities is well documented and WBC appear to be departing from recommendations in the GBBR. Please explain why WBC has done this and whether there is an action plan regarding infrastructure provision or cost benefit analysis on the overall impact on net social welfare?	None stated.	<p>This representation has been broadly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10. Nevertheless the Council will continue to consult with relevant utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and during the planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section10.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The site allocation is accompanied with a Sustainability Appraisal which assesses the sites against social, environmental and economic objectives to determine the overall sustainability of the site.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1062	Kevin	Davis	General	Whilst supporting residential development at Land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst (GB1) preference would be for the development to be affordable one or two bedroom homes (100% affordable if possible) with gardens built to a high sustainability standard such as the Rayne Close development. The site (GB1) should be allowed to come forward as soon as possible and not to wait until 2022. Development of GB1 should enable improved pedestrian (pavement access) access to Brookwood Crossroads. There must be overall improvements to Brookwood Crossroads. It would have been preferable for Sites GB1, GB2 and GB3 to comprise a single allocation to provide a better layout and to maximise the efficient use of the land. The splitting of Five Acres into two sites does not bear any reality on the ground. It is one site owned by two people with a single access. It has always been considered as one site and should remain as such. A Transit site should be separate from the established site if it is to support the entire Traveller community. The number of pitches should be restricted to what is recommended as good practice. At the moment the site comprise 13 permanent pitches and two temporary ones, which there is support to convert to permanent. There is a planning application for a further four pitches on the site. This would be an appropriate solution to provide additional pitches on the site. There are significant access issues with GB10 and GB11, which will directly affect Brookwood Ward. There are six routes to the sites all of which are too narrow to accommodate both construction traffic and the development traffic after the properties are occupied. This is the time to enter into negotiation to replace the bridge over the railway at Smarts Heath Road.	None stated.	<p>The Council recognises the significant unmet need for Affordable Housing in the Borough. This is well documented in the Core Strategy and by the available evidence such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and all efforts are being made for development to make a significant contribution towards meeting that need. However, it is also important that development reflects the mix of housing types needed in the area. Policy CS11: Housing Mix and CS12: Affordable Housing and the evidence contained in the SHMA demonstrate a need for a mix of housing types that has to be met. The appropriate percentage for each type of housing regarding the number of bedrooms and the proportion of Affordable Housing will depend on the character and density of the area and the viability of developing the site. These are matters of detail that appropriately be agreed at the planning application stage. It should be noted that the adjacent site that includes Five Acres is being proposed to comprise Traveller Pitches and a number of 100% affordable housing units. This will make a significant contribution towards Affordable Housing provision in the area. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Climate Change SPD will all make sure that the development of the site is of high quality design and high environmental standards. In the context of the overall spatial strategy for the Core Strategy, the Council wishes to direct most new development to previously developed land in the main centres of the Borough before consideration is given to the use of Green Belt land. This is necessary to facilitate the Council's overall objective of sustainable development, and is an expressed policy of the Core Strategy (Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing Provision and Distribution). There is evidence to demonstrate that the Council have identified sufficient previously development land to meet housing need up to 2022. Bringing the site forward before 2022 would therefore be against the spatial strategy of the Core strategy and the sustainability objectives of the Council, and there is no overriding reason to do so. Releasing the site for development before 2022 could set an unsustainable precedent for other allocated Green Belt sites. The proposed site allocation includes a specific requirement for detailed transport assessment to be carried out with the view to identify any appropriate mitigation measures. The need to improve pedestrian access from the site to Brookwood Crossroads is acknowledged. However, it is important that any mitigation is informed by the thorough transport assessment that is required to be carried out as part of any planning application for development of the site. Improvements to Brookwood Crossroads is a strategic transport scheme that the Council and the County Council are both committed to improve. It is identified in the Regulation 123 List for the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and the Woking Transport Strategy and Programme. The Council will continue to work in partnership with the County Council to make sure that this commitment is delivered when the funding is secured. The overall strategic decision to focus the delivery of Travellers accommodation on the existing established Traveller sites where it is felt that there is the capacity to do so remain. The Council is satisfied that the Five Acre site as a whole has the capacity to accommodate a net addition of 9 pitches (in additions to the permission for two temporary pitches that could get permanent approval in future). Taking account of the representation and further discussions with the two landowners of the site, the proposed allocations GB2 and GB3 will be merged into a single site and the uses on the site redefined to comprise Traveller pitches, a transit site for Travellers and a number of 100%</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Affordable Housing units. The design and layout of any proposal on the site will ensure a visible separation of the uses on the site without undermining the general character of the area. This matter has been addressed above. Five Acres has been allocated as a single site. Five Acres has been allocated to enable the delivery of Traveller Pitches, Transit site and 100% Affordable Housing units. The layout and configuration of the uses on the site will be a matter of detail that will be prescribed at the planning application stage rather than having a separate allocation as a transit site. It is always envisaged that there will be a visible separation of the transit site from the permanent pitches through the design of any proposal that will come forward. The Council believes that because of the ownership arrangements for the site, it could function effectively with additional 9 pitches instead of the 4 suggested by the representation. The site has relatively been managed well over the years and there is no reason to suggest that will not be the case if there is a net addition of 9 pitches. A strategic transport assessment has been carried out to assess the traffic implications of the proposals. The assessment has concluded that with appropriate mitigation measures the transport impacts of the development can be addressed. The Site Allocations DPD requires development proposals to be accompanied by a detailed transport assessment to determine access arrangements and other site specific mitigation measures to address any identified adverse impacts. Whilst the concerns raised are shared, it is also the case that they can be mitigated. The Council is working with the County Council to develop further strategic mitigation measures to address the traffic implications of the proposed allocations.	
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Support the removal of this site from the GB to deliver housing, as it has been unused for a number of years.  However concerned by Octagon proposals for the site as it is not considered that it is the best use of site. It is preferred that the listed building be restored and reused for a community use.	None stated.	The first part of the representation is noted. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.  The planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.  The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits. The proposal will need to demonstrate that it meets the relevant Development Plan policies including policy CS20 Heritage and Conservation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Consider better use of Broadoaks through the delivery of affordable housing for retired residents. So they have the opportunity to downsize, which could free up larger homes for families	None stated.	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.  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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Has there been a full and thorough assessment of brown field land?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Has there been a full and thorough assessment of brown field land?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	The present health care facilities are at capacity, and its difficult to get appointments. How will residents get the service needed.	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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	The present health care facilities are at capacity, and its difficult to get appointments. How will residents get the service needed.	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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Objects to the scale of the development which could accommodate around 6000 new residents (based on 2.38 people per household). This would put a massive strain on infrastructure	None stated.	The 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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	<p>Has major concerns regarding the road network. Parvis Road is congested, heavily trafficked road and would get worse.</p> <p>The Council's various traffic studies demonstrates that the A245/Parvis Road is over trafficked and burdensome on the local community, and regularly exceeds the measure for determining congestion.</p> <p>Car ownership averages at 1.5 cars per household therefore proposals could add 1100 additional cars on the road. The proposals could also mean over 1000 additional pupils- adding school traffic.</p> <p>The concern is that the increase in traffic will cause safety issues and major hold ups on Parvis Road.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	<p>Has major concerns regarding the road network. Parvis Road is congested, heavily trafficked road and would get worse. The Council's various traffic studies demonstrates that the A245/Parvis Road is over trafficked and burdensome on the local community, and regularly exceeds the measure for determining congestion. Car ownership averages at 1.5 cars per household therefore proposals could add 1100 additional cars on the road. The proposals could also mean over 1000 additional pupils- adding school traffic. The concern is that the increase in traffic will cause safety issues and major hold ups on Parvis Road.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	<p>The proposal to remove GB site in West Byfleet is disproportionate and a concern. Understands the need for housing but this should be in an appropriate area, where there is supporting infrastructure so not to adversely affect residents quality of life</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 can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt and are in sustainable locations including good access to local services and infrastructure. In addition, proposals will be required to make contributions towards strategic infrastructure or in some cases provide on-site infrastructure where relevant. Infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters</p>	No further modification is 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>Topic Paper Section 3.0</p> <p>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>	
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	The proposal to remove GB site in West Byfleet is disproportionate and a concern. Understands the need for housing but this should be in an appropriate area, where there is supporting infrastructure so not to adversely affect residents quality of life	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 can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt and are in sustainable locations including good access to local services and infrastructure. In addition, proposals will be required to make contributions towards strategic infrastructure or in some cases provide on-site infrastructure where relevant. Infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p> <p>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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	<p>Concerned that there won't be enough state school places for children living in West Byfleet. The local infant and junior schools have reached a critical level and have not considered demand coming from a large development on West Hall and Broadoaks.</p> <p>There is no secondary school in West Byfleet.</p> <p>Note: The DPD states that West Byfleet has a Secondary School and Community Centre- these are incorrect</p>	Remove incorrect statements. The DPD states that West Byfleet has a Secondary School and Community Centre- these are incorrect	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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	<p>Concerned that there won't be enough state school places for children living in West Byfleet. The local infant and junior schools have reached a critical level and have not considered demand coming from a large development on West Hall and Broadoaks.</p> <p>There is no secondary school in West Byfleet.</p> <p>Note: The DPD states that West Byfleet has a Secondary School and Community Centre- these are incorrect</p>	Remove incorrect statements. The DPD states that West Byfleet has a Secondary School and Community Centre- these are incorrect	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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Sites should be considered in the context of all neighbouring Boroughs- Elmbridge and Guildford.	None stated.	<p>A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0. paragraph 1.5</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Sites should be considered in the context of all neighbouring Boroughs- Elmbridge and Guildford.	None stated.	<p>A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0. paragraph 1.5</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Availability should not be the prime reason for allocation.	None stated.	This representation 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Availability should not be the prime reason for allocation.	None stated.	This representation 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
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Increasing development will place pressure on existing utilities. Particularly water and sewage. Is the sewage plant in Wisley adequate to meet the increased need?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB16	Increasing development will place pressure on existing utilities. Particularly water and sewage. Is the sewage plant in Wisley adequate to meet the increased need?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Objecting to the release of West Hall	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1226	Chris, Emma	Davis	GB15	Object to the removal of this site from the GB. The site is the largest greenspace in West Byfleet and acts as noise buffer for the M25. It seems unjust to remove natural green space here. GB exists to prevent urban sprawl, provide habitats for wildlife and retain a unique rural character of communities. The proposals are out of character with the surrounding area. e.g. Dartnell Park estate.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>During the preparation of the 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>With regards to the representation on local character, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	Further consideration is required in relation to ecology, utilities, infrastructure	None stated.	This representation regarding infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9- 3.10, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	Further consideration is required in relation to ecology, utilities, infrastructure	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9- 3.10, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	Pyrford is already congested and the addition of 433 new homes will exacerbate traffic problems and result in gridlock	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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	Pyrford is already congested and the addition of 433 new homes will exacerbate traffic problems and result in gridlock	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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	Pyrford has a unique character and well maintained historic assets. The proposals for Pyrford will threaten the setting of heritage assets in the vicinity	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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	Pyrford has a unique character and well maintained historic assets. The proposals for Pyrford will threaten the setting of heritage assets in the vicinity	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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	The unspoilt charm and character of Pyrford would be lost 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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	The unspoilt charm and character of Pyrford would be lost 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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	Further consideration is required in relation to traffic implications to the south of the Borough- where significant development is proposed. Will the roads cope?	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	Further consideration is required in relation to traffic implications to the south of the Borough- where significant development is proposed. Will the roads cope?	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	WBC have substantially departed from recommendations in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	WBC have substantially departed from recommendations in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	PNF considers it unacceptable that WBC proceeded with a public consultation on draft DPD without full consideration of the points raised by PNF advisors.	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. You are correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. However it should be noted that responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	PNF considers it unacceptable that WBC proceeded with a public consultation on draft DPD without full consideration of the points raised by PNF advisors.	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. You are correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. However it should be noted that responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB12	WBC have ignored letters submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) raising concern about the GBBR and how it was applied to the Site Allocation DPD. Are repulsed that the Executive took the decision to proceed to publish the DPD without reviewing the valid representation.	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. You are correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. However it should be noted that responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1310	Richard, Rosemary	Davis	GB13	WBC have ignored letters submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) raising concern about the GBBR and how it was applied to the Site Allocation DPD. Are repulsed that the Executive took the decision to proceed to publish the DPD without reviewing the valid representation.	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. You are correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. However it should be noted that responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB8	Attachments - Copies of letter from Mayford Village Society (15 December 2009) regarding the Core Strategy Character Assessment for Mayford Village, Character Assessment Questionnaire, associated information.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The 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.	
173	Ronald	Dawes	General	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9 and 11. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB10	I moved here because Mayford has much green space, good communications enabling residents to reach most places easily by car. I strongly object to proposals for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB11	I moved here because Mayford has much green space, good communications enabling residents to reach most places easily by car. I strongly object to proposals for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB14	I moved here because Mayford has much green space, good communications enabling residents to reach most places easily by car. I strongly object to proposals for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB8	I moved here because Mayford has much green space, good communications enabling residents to reach most places easily by car. I strongly object to proposals for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB9	I moved here because Mayford has much green space, good communications enabling residents to reach most places easily by car. I strongly object to proposals for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Paper.	
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB8	The GBBR report is flawed and cannot be relied upon. It: 1) assesses only the sites put forward, not others 2) compares sites but is arbitrary in its scoring 3) lacks a Character Assessment of the Village (ignoring the locally prepared analysis in 2009) 4) the poor highway network, flood plain, listed buildings and conservation areas, SSSI, lack of infrastructure and poor access to Worplesdon Station, are absent 5) 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. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues around A320. 7) Mayford has little facilities in its 'village centre'. The proposed housing is not justified, it would have a significant impact on the Village, making it an adjunct of Woking and eroding the strategic gap between Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council considerer the Green Belt boundary review as robust enough to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The methodology applied to carry out the review is also robust to ensure consistency in the scoring. It looks at the lancape sensitivity of each of the sites/land to accommodate growth, which is the appropriate the study. The Council has carried out a Lancape Character Assessment, and the is nothing in the study that will cause the Council to changes its decisions on lancape grounds. The manner in which the lancape implications of the proposals have been addressed has been comprehensively dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. Section 3 of the Topic Paper deals with infrastructure provision, and Section 5 deals with flood risk. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 21. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1 and 2 of the Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB10	The GBBR report is flawed and cannot be relied upon. It: 1) assesses only the sites put forward, not others 2) compares sites but is arbitrary in its scoring 3) lacks a Character Assessment of the Village (ignoring the locally prepared analysis in 2009) 4) the poor highway network, flood plain, listed buildings and conservation areas, SSSI, lack of infrastructure and poor access to Worplesdon Station, are absent 5) 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. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues around A320. 7) Mayford has little facilities in its 'village centre'. The proposed housing is not justified, it would have a significant impact on the Village, making it an adjunct of Woking and eroding the strategic gap between Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet its development needs. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the Core Strategy period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review adopts the right approach to assessing the lancape implications for accommodating development on the proposed allocated sites. Since the DPD was published for Regulation 18 consultation, the Council has published a Borough-wide lancape assessment. There is nothing in this study that will change the decision make by the Council on lancape grounds. The Green Belt boundary review was a comprehensive review of the entire Green Belt. The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative sites in the Green Belt. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives. 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. 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
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB11	The GBBR report is flawed and cannot be relied upon. It: 1) assesses only the sites put forward, not others 2) compares sites but is arbitrary in its scoring 3) lacks a Character Assessment of the Village (ignoring the locally prepared analysis in 2009) 4) the poor highway network, flood plain, listed buildings and conservation areas, SSSI, lack of infrastructure and poor access to Worplesdon Station, are absent 5) 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. Further developments	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet its development needs. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the Core Strategy period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review adopts the right approach to assessing the lancape implications for accommodating development on the proposed allocated sites. Since the DPD was published for Regulation 18 consultation, the Council has published a Borough-wide lancape assessment. There is nothing in this study that will change the decision make by the Council on lancape grounds. The Green Belt boundary review was a comprehensive review 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
				in the local area will increase the traffic issues around A320. 7) Mayford has little facilities in its 'village centre'. The proposed housing is not justified, it would have a significant impact on the Village, making it an adjunct of Woking and eroding the strategic gap between Mayford and Guildford.		entire Green Belt. The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative sites in the Green Belt. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives. 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. 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.	
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB9	The GBBR report is flawed and cannot be relied upon. It: 1) assesses only the sites put forward, not others 2) compares sites but is arbitrary in its scoring 3) lacks a Character Assessment of the Village (ignoring the locally prepared analysis in 2009) 4) the poor highway network, flood plain, listed buildings and conservation areas, SSSI, lack of infrastructure and poor access to Worplesdon Station, are absent 5) 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. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues around A320. 7) Mayford has little facilities in its 'village centre'. The proposed housing is not justified, it would have a significant impact on the Village, making it an adjunct of Woking and eroding the strategic gap between Mayford and Guildford.	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. The Council is satisfied that the report and the methodology used to carry it out are robust enough to be used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The study was a comprehensive Green Belt review that assessed the landscape sensitivity of all the parcels of land to accommodate growth. The allocated sites can be developed without compromising the overall purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD is also informed by a Transport Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment. Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites have been carried out to demonstrate that the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the other alternatives. 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 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
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB14	The GBBR report is flawed and cannot be relied upon. It: 1) assesses only the sites put forward, not others 2) compares sites but is arbitrary in its scoring 3) lacks a Character Assessment of the Village (ignoring the locally prepared analysis in 2009) 4) the poor highway network, flood plain, listed buildings and conservation areas, SSSI, lack of infrastructure and poor access to Worplesdon Station, are absent 5) 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. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues around A320. 7) Mayford has little facilities in its 'village centre'. The proposed housing is not justified, it would have a significant impact on the Village, making it an adjunct of Woking and eroding the strategic gap between Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary	No further modification is 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 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. The Council has relied on a range of studies to inform the DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report and the Sustainability Appraisal. Collectively, the evidence supports and justifies the allocation of the sites.	
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB7	Concerned that Woking Borough Council is picking and choosing which Green Belt Review recommendations it uses for its decisions. It accepts those to develop in Mayford, though assumptions are unsound, but ignores the Review's rejection of Ten Acre Farm. Some confused thinking.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is contaminated, has poor access to local amenities, would be expensive to construct (£125k per pitch). The owner of the site does not to expand the site, preferring a permanent residence. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or to the impact on village character.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
173	Ronald	Dawes	GB7	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancaple 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 Lancaple grounds. The Lancaple 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 Lancaple 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>	
185	Margaret	Dawes	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 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effects on this historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	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 the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB11	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB14	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB8	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB9	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The issue about the separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB11	No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet its development needs. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the Core Strategy period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review adopts the right approach to assessing the landscape implications for accommodating development on the proposed allocated sites. Since the DPD was published for Regulation 18 consultation, the Council has published a Borough-wide landscape assessment. There is nothing in this study that will change the decision made by the Council on landscape grounds. The Green Belt boundary review was a comprehensive review of the entire Green Belt. The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative sites in the Green Belt. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives. 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. 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB8	No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be 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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB9	No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be 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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB10	No consideration to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, to impact on the character of the village or on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The 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
185	Margaret	Dawes	GB14	No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						M3 and the County Council to ensure 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	
501	Laura	Day	GB12	The area cannot handle the additional people and cars. Congestion will be created with additional traffic, with additional concern raised due to lorries driving past during construction. Local shops in Pyrford would struggle to cope with additional demand.	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
501	Laura	Day	GB13	The area cannot handle the additional people and cars. Congestion will be created with additional traffic, with additional concern raised due to lorries driving past during construction. Local shops in Pyrford would struggle to cope with additional demand.	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
501	Laura	Day	GB12	Concerned about the plans for 423 new houses in Pyrford as they would be hugely detrimental to the charm, tranquillity, beautiful landscapes and green-ness of the village. This is the reason people choose to live in Pyrford and love the area. The additional houses will ruin this, reduce the village feel and provide a feeling similar to West Byfleet; grey.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
501	Laura	Day	GB13	Concerned about the plans for 423 new houses in Pyrford as they would be hugely detrimental to the charm, tranquillity, beautiful landscapes and green-ness of the village. This is the reason people choose to live in Pyrford and love the area. The additional houses will ruin this, reduce the village feel and provide a feeling similar to West Byfleet; grey.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
501	Laura	Day	GB12	Hopes the Council will reconsider plans for Pyrford, or at least significantly reduce the number of houses proposed. Cramming 400+ houses onto Green Belt land is likely to completely change the atmosphere of the village, lead to congestion of already busy roads. Pyrford is a green, peaceful, friendly village and should stay that way.	None stated.	The proposed number of houses is based on the indicative densities set out in the Core Strategy, Policy CS10. This was considered suitable during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. Nevertheless this will be considered in detail and determined at the planning application stage post 2027 when the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. It should be noted that fewer dwellings could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet the identified housing need. In addition, most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
501	Laura	Day	GB13	Hopes the Council will reconsider plans for Pyrford, or at least significantly reduce the number of houses proposed. Cramming 400+ houses onto Green Belt land is likely to completely change the atmosphere of the village, lead to congestion of already busy roads. Pyrford is a green, peaceful, friendly village and should stay that way.	None stated.	The proposed number of houses is based on the indicative densities set out in the Core Strategy, Policy CS10. This was considered suitable during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. Nevertheless this will be considered in detail and determined at the planning application stage post 2027 when the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. It should be noted that fewer dwellings could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet the identified housing need.  In addition, most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1688	Lorraine	De Jong	GB8	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1688	Lorraine	De Jong	GB9	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1688	Lorraine	De Jong	GB10	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1688	Lorraine	De Jong	GB11	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1688	Lorraine	De Jong	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density. The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	None stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB12	Development would be unacceptable due to additional traffic worsening already intolerable congestion. Please reconsider the proposal.	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
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB13	Development would be unacceptable due to additional traffic worsening already intolerable congestion. Please reconsider the proposal.	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
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB12	Objects to the proposed construction of 423 dwellings. While there is a housing shortage, proposals should be concentrated on brownfield sites initially.	None stated.	Comment noted, however there has been thorough appraisal of reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through the Council's 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
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB13	Objects to the proposed construction of 423 dwellings. While there is a housing shortage, proposals should be concentrated on brownfield sites initially.	None stated.	Comment noted, however there has been thorough appraisal of reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield sites, through the Council's 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
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB12	Thereafter if more housing is required Green Belt land should not be used unless considered appropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB13	Thereafter if more housing is required Green Belt land should not be used unless considered appropriate. This site was rejected by the Council's consultants for housing.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 11.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB12	The are is valuable as it provides excellent views of the North Downs, that cannot be seen elsewhere.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
469	Pauline	de Marco	GB13	The are is valuable as it provides excellent views of the North Downs, that cannot be seen elsewhere.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	There are no doctors, primary schools or church	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. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.	
692	Janet	Deacon	GB11	There are no doctors, primary schools or church	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>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB14	There are no doctors, primary schools or church	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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB7	Already have a Travellers site close to this site and another can not be justified. This area is important for wildlife and floods regularly.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
692	Janet	Deacon	General	Object to sites being removed from the Green Belt. Green Belt protects green spaces and prevents areas from joining together, which are important concepts, and even more important today than when first drawn up.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						proposed sites will not reduce the gap between the town and other towns/settlements in the area. This is set out in the Green Belt boundary review.	
692	Janet	Deacon	GB8	Woking will merge with Mayford and the village will lose its identity as a village. Woking will then extend as far as Prey Heath Road	None stated.	This representation 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB9	Woking will merge with Mayford and the village will lose its identity as a village. Woking will then extend as far as Prey Heath Road	None stated.	This representation 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	Woking will merge with Mayford and the village will lose its identity as a village. Woking will then extend as far as Prey Heath Road	None stated.	This representation 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB14	The site would merge Mayford and Woking. The site is a green barrier and the land is low lying.	None stated.	This site is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure. Therefore the site is expected to enhance lancape and biodiversity features and create publically accessible open space.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
692	Janet	Deacon	GB8	The roads regularly flood	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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB9	The roads regularly flood	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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	The roads regularly flood	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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	Saunders Lane and other local roads and bridges are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes.	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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB11	Saunders Lane and other local roads and bridges are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes.	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.	
692	Janet	Deacon	GB14	Saunders Lane and other local roads and bridges are very narrow and can not sustain any increase in traffic volumes.	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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB8	The traffic situation will be significantly worse. Other restrictions on surrounding roads such as Victoria Arch will make it impossible for the roads to take any more 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 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB9	The traffic situation will be significantly worse. Other restrictions on surrounding roads such as Victoria Arch will make it impossible for the roads to take any more 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 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	The traffic situation will be significantly worse. Other restrictions on surrounding roads such as Victoria Arch will make it impossible for the roads to take any more 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 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB8	There are no doctor surgeries in south Woking and not enough infrastructure to support large scale development.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.  The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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
692	Janet	Deacon	GB9	There are no doctor surgeries in south Woking and not enough infrastructure to support large scale development.	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
						The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	
692	Janet	Deacon	GB10	There are no doctor surgeries in south Woking and not enough infrastructure to support large scale development.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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
692	Janet	Deacon	General	Appreciate the need for housing but not in this way. Council has previously refused infill development in the Green Belt and no variation was allowed. These smaller infill sites would have been a better solution. Not all brownfield sites have been used and whilst these sites might be more difficult to develop, they will have less impact. The provision of medical services also needs to be addressed.	None stated.	Development proposals in the Green Belt will be required to comply with the Green Belt policies of the NPPF, Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. The government is very clear on what is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.  The Site Allocations DPD only allocates strategic sites, i.e. residential sites of 10 units or more. The SHLAA has a residential site threshold of 6 units or more. The Council is aware that smaller sites will come forward over the plan period within the existing urban area. Nevertheless, these small sites will not meet the housing need of the Borough. Therefore the Council has a responsibility to plan, through the plan making process, for future development needs. The Council's response to this in more detail has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.  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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB8	The proposed developments will remove the green area between Woking and Mayford, merging the two areas. This is not what the majority of Mayford and Woking residents want to happen.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB9	The proposed developments will remove the green area between Woking and Mayford, merging the two areas. This is not what the majority of Mayford and Woking residents want to happen.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB10	The proposed developments will remove the green area between Woking and Mayford, merging the two areas. This is not what the majority of Mayford and Woking residents want to happen.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB11	The proposed developments will remove the green area between Woking and Mayford, merging the two areas. This is not what the majority of Mayford and Woking residents want to happen.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB14	The proposed developments will remove the green area between Woking and Mayford, merging the two areas. This is not what the majority of Mayford and Woking residents want to happen.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB8	Development will cause significant traffic problems because of existing railway bridge restrictions.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB9	Development will cause significant traffic problems because of existing railway bridge restrictions.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB10	Development will cause significant traffic problems because of existing railway bridge restrictions.	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. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within 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
						by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
868	Richard	Deacon	GB11	Development will cause significant traffic problems because of existing railway bridge restrictions.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB14	Development will cause significant traffic problems because of existing railway bridge restrictions.	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.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB7	Why provide more pitches here when there are already sites nearby.	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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB7	Recognises the need for housing, however Green Belt should be last resort. There are numerous smaller parcels of land and brownfield land that could be used and would distribute the impact of development on infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation regarding Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.  In addition, the representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.  The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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
868	Richard	Deacon	GB8	Existing drainage infrastructure will be overwhelmed due to the scale of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
868	Richard	Deacon	GB9	Existing drainage infrastructure will be overwhelmed due to the scale of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
868	Richard	Deacon	GB10	Existing drainage infrastructure will be overwhelmed due to the scale of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
868	Richard	Deacon	GB11	Existing drainage infrastructure will be overwhelmed due to the scale of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
868	Richard	Deacon	GB14	Existing drainage infrastructure will be overwhelmed due to the scale of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Objects to the plans for 400 additional residential units in Pырford.	None stated.	The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is set out in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Outlines an example of Wokingham where a small town has been 'ruined' and is losing its character due to over development. This has caused big problems on local roads.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will ruin the area. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Against the proposal as the Borough has ignored the Pырford Neighbourhood Forums two letters raising concern about and objecting to the Green Belt Review. Also repulsed by the Executive's decision to publish the DPD without reviewing	None stated.	The concerns expressed by residents of Pырford have not been ignored. However, the Council has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. This is evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				valid representations.			
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Questions whether it is acceptable that the Council has substantially departed from Peter Brett's Green Belt Review recommendations concerning Pyrford. Also questions whether it is acceptable that the Council have deferred action on comments made by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum advisers and approve a DPD over which there are significant questions around Pyrford sites.	None stated.	The matter about the Green Belt boundary review is comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In summary, the Council has used a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper to inform the DPD and collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites. The Council has not ignored the views 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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Questions whether the Council agrees that Pyrford's charm and character, and maintaining the natural landscape and views, and footpaths are important? States that Pyrford is unique in Woking Borough due to its relatively unspoilt countryside and asks whether this is an asset for the entire 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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	States that Pyrford is unique due to its well maintained historic buildings and conservation areas, heritage assets that are highly valued nationally. Removal of the Green Belt status from the two fields as proposed could cause irreparable damage to these assets.	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the character of the area and its heritage assets. This issue has been addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Points to congestion during the day in the central village area of Pyrford and the development of 433 houses would be likely to increase congestion and potentially result in gridlock.  Questions whether the Council is satisfied with traffic and highways congestion at present.	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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Highlights the lack of focus on the impacts of major housing development just over the Woking Borough border in Guildford e.g. Wisley airfield and two other sites, particularly traffic and those using West Byfleet station and retail centre.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with its neighbouring authorities to make sure that the cross boundary implications of the proposals are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts on Woking. The traffic implications of the proposals in the Site Allocations DOD is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Highlights a number of impacts from development, including on ecology, biodiversity, water, sewerage, transport and other 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Re-building at Pyrford Primary school is expected to meet a slight increase in pupils to meet current demand. The proposed 433 new houses will create a massive need for	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
				school places.			
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Housing and care facilities for the elderly are needed	None stated.	The Core Strategy offers an in principle support for the provision of elderly people accommodation. Site GB16 also makes provision for elderly peoples accommodation. In addition, there are robust policies to ensure that development makes provision for the appropriate mix of dwelling types and that houses are built to enable adaptation for the various stages of life.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Nursery and Pre School facilities are at capacity at present	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Pyrford village is an attractive community where people want to live largely due to its pleasant environment. Safety and the character if the village with its wide variety of facilities are important and once destroyed cannot easily be re-created.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular 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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Some change and development (as suggested) must occur for Pyrford to move forward and continue as a vibrant, growing community. Questions whether wholesale change on the scale proposed is the solution, and suggests that development should focus on housing for older people, affordable housing and other innovative options.	Suggests focusing on the supply of suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens, or encouraging genuinely affordable homes, which are lacking.	The are comments note. The proposals will make provision a range of house types such as Affordable Housing and accommodation for the elderly. However, the Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet the development needs of the area and the proposals will make a contribution towards that and also ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council acknowledge that Pyrford has a distinctive character and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt and it is not expected that the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt will be undermined by the proposals. 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
51	David	Derrick	GB12	Copy of response sent from the Neighbourhood Forum to encourage responses to this consultation.	None stated.	Comment 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Objects to the plans for 400 additional residential units in Pyrford.	None stated.	The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is set out in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Outlines an example of Wokingham where a small town has been 'ruined' and is losing its character due to over development. This has caused big problems on local roads.	None stated.	The Council will make sure that its proposals does not ruin the character of the area. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected. 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 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Against the proposal as the Borough has ignored the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forums two letters raising concern about and objecting to the Green Belt Review. Also repulsed by the Executive's decision to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations.	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. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Questions whether it is acceptable that the Council has substantially departed from Peter Brett's Green Belt Review recommendations concerning Pyrford. Also questions whether it is acceptable that the Council have deferred action on comments made by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum advisers and approve a DPD over which there are significant questions around Pyrford sites.	None stated.	The matter about the Green Belt boundary review is comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In summary, the Council has used a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper to inform the DPD and collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites. The Council has not ignored the views 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Questions whether the Council agrees that Pyrford's charm and character, and maintaining the natural landscape and views, and footpaths are important? States that Pyrford is unique in Woking Borough due to its relatively unspoilt countryside and asks whether this is an asset for the entire 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	States that Pyrford is unique due to its well maintained historic buildings and conservation areas, heritage assets that are highly valued nationally. Removal of the Green Belt status from the two fields as proposed could cause irreparable damage to these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council accept that Pyrford has a distinctive character but believes this will not be compromised by the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Points to congestion during the day in the central village area of Pyrford and the development of 433 houses would be likely to increase congestion and potentially result in gridlock.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Questions whether the Council is satisfied with traffic and highways congestion at present.		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.	
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Highlights the lack of focus on the impacts of major housing development just over the Woking Borough border in Guildford e.g. Wisley airfield and two other sites, particularly traffic and those using West Byfleet station and retail centre.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford Borough Council to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals such as development at the Wisley Airfield are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Highlights a number of impacts from development, including on ecology, biodiversity, water, sewerage, transport and other 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. During the preparation of the 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Re-building at Pyrford Primary school is expected to meet a slight increase in pupils to meet current demand. The proposed 433 new houses will create a massive need for 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Housing and care facilities for the elderly are needed	None stated.	The Council will ensure that any proposal that comes forward includes an appropriate mix of house types, including elderly people accommodation. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy offers an in-principle support for the provision of elderly people's accommodation. In addition Proposal GB16 includes a mix of uses including elder people people's accommodation. The Council is therefore planning positively to meet the needs of the elderly population. 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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Nursery and Pre School facilities are at capacity at present	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Pyrford village is an attractive community where people want to live largely due to its pleasant environment. Safety and the character of the village with its wide variety of facilities are important and once destroyed cannot easily be re-created.	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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Some change and development (as suggested) must occur for Pyrford to move forward and continue as a vibrant, growing community. Questions whether wholesale change on the scale proposed is the solution, and suggests that development should focus on housing for older people, affordable housing and other innovative options.	Suggests focusing on the supply of suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens, or encouraging genuinely affordable homes, which are lacking.	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
51	David	Derrick	GB13	Copy of response sent from the Neighbourhood Forum to encourage responses to this consultation.	None stated.	Comment noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1579	Peter, Daphe	Derwent	GB12	The road network will not be able to cope with the increase in population	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1579	Peter, Daphe	Derwent	GB13	The road network will not be able to cope with the increase in population	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
1579	Peter, Daphe	Derwent	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. People move to Pyrford for the Green Belt and there is no more room for more people.	None stated.	The Council's response to the principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.  The representation regarding the impact on the character of the village 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
1579	Peter, Daphe	Derwent	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. People move to Pyrford for the Green Belt and there is no more room for more people.	None stated.	The Council's response to the principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.  The representation regarding the impact on the character of the village 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
774	John	Dewar	Pathways of Impact	A combination of these	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
774	John	Dewar	Cumulative impacts	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
774	John	Dewar	GB4	Objects to the proposals. The land is in a flood plain and blighted by the noise of the M25. Further development will result in more traffic congestion. How can this be justified?	Protect green belt, it's there to stop development, if every generation erodes it there will be none left. My vote will go to councillors blocking development.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures, including the policies of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the development of the site 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 notes the road capacity issues at the Six Crossroads Roundabout and have specifically allocated it under site GB6 to carry out a proposed junction upgrade and improvements to side roads. The proposed modification regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	
117	John	Dibley	GB12	Objects to proposals and agrees with objections raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has responded to the representation by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. See Rep ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
117	John	Dibley	GB13	Objects to proposals and agrees with objections raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has responded to the representation by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. See Rep ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	Identifying sites for allocation	2. The Green Belt Review clearly sets out the purposes of the Green Belt defined by national planning policy, and reiterated in the Core Strategy. It then proceeds to ignore these purposes. They are sacrificed at the altar of land availability, deliverability, suitability and sustainability.	None stated.	While the purposes of the Green Belt are set out in both the Green Belt Review and Core Strategy, there is justification for the release of Green Belt land for development, to meet future development requirements of the Core Strategy. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1. to 1.14.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	3. The traffic implications of the proposals are alarming. Referring to 2010 and 2015 strategic studies. In assessing the performance of a stretch of road, 'Level of Service' (LOS) there are six levels with A (free flow) being the best and F (every vehicle moves in lockstep with the vehicle in front of it) being worst. The projected LOS with West Hall and Broadoaks for employment use is level F, with the greatest traffic impacts occurring on the A245 Parvis/ Old Woking Road in both directions. In other words gridlock; the roads are simply not fit for purpose. Add in the effect of a school of 900 pupils. The mitigation measures of bus stops, bicycle paths and a new roundabout would have minor beneficial impacts on an already hopelessly inadequate road network.	None stated.	Comment noted. The mitigation measures put forward are intended to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development, but it is acknowledged that they may not improve all existing traffic or road network issues in the area. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, Section 20.0, paragraph 20.1 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	3. The traffic implications of the proposals are alarming. Referring to 2010 and 2015 strategic studies. In assessing the performance of a stretch of road, 'Level of Service' (LOS) there are six levels with A (free flow) being the best and F (every vehicle moves in lockstep with the vehicle in front of it) being worst. The projected LOS with West Hall and Broadoaks for employment use is level F, with the greatest traffic impacts occurring on the A245 Parvis/ Old Woking Road in both directions. In other words gridlock; the roads are simply not fit for purpose. Add in the effect of a school of 900 pupils. The mitigation measures of bus stops, bicycle paths and a new roundabout would have minor beneficial impacts on an already hopelessly inadequate road network.	None stated.	Comment noted. The mitigation measures put forward are intended to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development, but it is acknowledged that they may not improve all existing traffic or road network issues in the area. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, Section 20.0, paragraph 20.1 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
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	4. If both Broadoaks and West Hall go ahead the population of West Byfleet is likely to increase by 25% to 33%. This will create strains on infrastructure (particularly health/GP services and schools) that is already struggling to meet existing demand. We need advice as to what increase in population services can cope with.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the allocations has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.1-3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	4. If both Broadoaks and West Hall go ahead the population of West Byfleet is likely to increase by 25% to 33%. This will create strains on infrastructure (particularly health/GP services and schools) that is already struggling to meet existing demand. We need advice as to what increase in population services can cope with.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the allocations has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.1-3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	Identifying sites for allocation	5. Conclusions. Urban/ brownfield sites - questions whether the Council is satisfied that they have used all available urban/ brownfield sites prior to encroaching on Green Belt. Has a report confirming this been commissioned?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, paragraphs 9.1-9.3 and Section 11.0, paragraph 11.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	5. Conclusions. Urban/ brownfield sites - questions whether the Council is satisfied that they have used all available urban/ brownfield sites prior to encroaching on Green Belt. Has a report confirming this been commissioned?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, paragraphs 9.1-9.3 and Section 11.0, paragraph 11.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	5. Conclusions. Urban/ brownfield sites - questions whether the Council is satisfied that they have used all available urban/ brownfield sites prior to encroaching on Green Belt. Has a report confirming this been commissioned?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, paragraphs 9.1-9.3 and Section 11.0, paragraph 11.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	A transport solution must go hand in hand with any planning consents. We need joined up policy. Relegating it to S106 agreements will not work as most people do not believe there is a viable transport solution for the scale of development proposed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation's Key Requirements states that the exact nature of transport infrastructure of this site will be determined through a pre-application discussion (i.e. site specific solutions have neither been proposed or agreed yet), informed by a Transport Assessment and prepared to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. The allocation outlines that a key issue to be addressed is the significant infrastructure required to provide access to the A245.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	A transport solution must go hand in hand with any planning consents. We need joined up policy. Relegating it to S106 agreements will not work as most people do not believe there is a viable transport solution for the scale of development proposed.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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 in Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	Identifying sites for allocation	The BGBR shows that West Hall has major importance for Green Belt purposes, very low suitability as an area of search, little or no capacity for change and in spite of this is removed from the Green Belt simply because it is available, deliverable and the proposed density can support 592 new homes. This is a non-sequitur. In one site WBC can conveniently meet Green Belt residential requirements to 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in this Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 17.0. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	The BGBR shows that West Hall has major importance for Green Belt purposes, very low suitability as an area of search, little or no capacity for change and in spite of this is removed from the Green Belt simply because it is available, deliverable and the proposed density can support 592 new homes. This is a non-sequitur. In one site WBC can conveniently meet Green Belt residential requirements to 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in this Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 17.0. 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. 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	No further modification is 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 will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	Broadoaks can be more easily integrated. It may not make sense to build the private school but instead approve additional housing, but only if a community balance can be achieved and essential infrastructure provided. The total number of homes should be significantly less than 550, and be subject to the road and transport considerations discussed.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process, and it will be required to provide a contribution to the necessary infrastructure. There is further information on the Council's approach to infrastructure delivery, including road and transport improvements, in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	6. At present around 63% WBC is Green Belt but this is not broken down by ward. Believes that if West Hall is developed as proposed West Byfleet will lose 80-90% of its Green Belt land. This is not acceptable. Public consultation by West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum established that 95% of local residents did not wish to lose any Green Belt land. WBC and Councillors should not lightly dismiss such a overwhelming expression of democratic opinion.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council acknowledges the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum survey results and 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
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	It has already been agreed and approved that the site is excluded from the Green Belt. Therefore any homes built on this site do not count towards the Green Belt allocation.	None stated.	The site is already a major developed site within the Green Belt, but it is not yet excluded from the Green Belt. The draft Site Allocations DPD intends to remove the site from the Green Belt to enable development of an employment led mixed use (including residential) scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	The Octagon residential proposals look attractive although clearly not in accord with WBC's current thinking. The inclusion of the private school introduces a new dimension with major infrastructure issues (as below).	None stated.	As acknowledged in the comment, the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. There is, however, relevant background to this comment and the proposed allocation in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	Outlines the requirement for WBC to build 550 homes on Green Belt land between 2022 and 2027, its proposal to build 550 homes at West Hall (plus 42 post 2027) meaning West Byfleet contributes the total Green Belt allocation and loses nearly all its Green Belt land. This is not reasonable, equitable or fair. Does not believe the Minister will be sympathetic to such an ill-considered, clumsy, bureaucratic and undemocratic decision.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	Discusses this in point 3 above. The effect on traffic, as outlined in strategic transport studies, will be unacceptable and unsustainable. The proposed solutions are woefully inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation's Key Requirements states that the exact nature of transport infrastructure of this site will be determined through a pre-application discussion (i.e. site specific solutions have neither been proposed or agreed yet), informed by a Transport Assessment and prepared to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. The allocation outlines that a key issue to be addressed is the significant infrastructure required to provide access to the A245.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	Discusses this in point 3 above. The effect on traffic, as outlined in strategic transport studies, will be unacceptable and unsustainable. The proposed solutions are woefully inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation's Key Requirements states that the exact nature of transport infrastructure of this site will be determined through a pre-application discussion (i.e. site specific solutions have neither been proposed or agreed yet), informed by a Transport Assessment and prepared to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. The allocation outlines that a key issue to be addressed is the significant infrastructure required to provide access to the A245.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	The density proposals are excessive and percentage of affordable housing inappropriate. There is a lack of consideration to provision and availability of community care and support services.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The general approach to infrastructure provision is outlined in Section 3.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	Purpose How the Site Allocations	1. Sets out core statements on Core Strategy housing delivery in the Borough from 2010 to 2027. Outlines that the requirement for 292 new homes per annum can be met using	None stated.	Comment 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
			are structured	existing brownfield sites until 2022 and thereafter is dependent on the release of Green Belt land.			
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	The proposed development has been subjective and opportunistic in the release of Green Belt land, and fails to address social and community issues and concerns. It will adversely impact quality of life of West Byfleet residents.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 9.0 to 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	The current approval for employment-led mixed use development to include office and research premises has received little interest. The application that Octagon are submitting for 157 new homes and a 900 pupil private secondary school, will create significant traffic issues due to the school. The allocation makes clear that the developer will contribute to provision of essential transport infrastructure to help mitigate the impact of development of the site, and lists issues to be addressed. However the A245 is already highly congested and I cannot see how a significant increase to the traffic flow can be mitigated in an acceptable manner by a site access junction.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB16	Public consultation by West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum established that 95% of local residents did not wish to lose any Green Belt land. WBC and Councillors should not lightly dismiss such a overwhelming expression of democratic opinion.	None stated.	These views will be given due consideration, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant planning regulations. In addition, please see Section 6.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	Identifying sites for allocation	The report [Green Belt Review] lacks analytical rigour and consistency. It states that West Byfleet has a secondary school and a community centre, which is incorrect. If the consultants cannot get the basics right the reader has every right to doubt the thoroughness of the overall approach.	None stated.	These inconsistencies are noted. While it is acknowledged that there is no secondary school within West Byfleet itself, the Green Belt Review would be referring to Bishop David Brown School in Sheerwater, which is reasonably nearby (1 mile from the centre of West Byfleet District Centre). Community centre provision is at the Cornerstone Centre, attached to St John's Church, amongst other locations in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1417	Stewart	Dick	GB15	Outline's the proposal for the site, to permit 550 homes between 2022 and 2027 with the retention of land for the construction of 42 more homes from 2027 to 2040. Outlines that any development would need to include significant elements of Green Infrastructure and development requirements including a density of 40 dph, 50% affordable housing, and significant highway, access and transport improvements.	None stated.	These points are noted and as stated, covered in the Key Requirements listed in the draft allocation, as part of what development of the site must address. Further detail on transport infrastructure can be found in Section 3.0 (paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB4	the road network will not cope, it is already strained	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB5	the road network will not cope, it is already strained	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The various transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB4	Appalled to realise that proposals submitted to the Council from Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum in the last two years, signed by over 2,700 residents, had not been considered before the Council's plans were published.	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
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB5	Appalled to realise that proposals submitted to the Council from Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum in the last two years, signed by over 2,700 residents, had not been considered before the Council's plans were published.	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
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB4	Historically, fields by Manor House were sold on basis of it being used for agricultural purposes only, however it was then altered into development land for housing. Does not want the situation repeated.	Consider brownfield land first	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB5	Historically, fields by Manor House were sold on basis of it being used for agricultural purposes only, however it was then altered into development land for housing. Does not want the situation repeated.	Consider brownfield land first	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new	No further modification is 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 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	
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB4	No consideration has been given to flooding issues in the village. Further consideration needed.	Further consideration required for flooding issues	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
432	Sheilia	Dickson	GB5	No consideration has been given to flooding issues in the village. Further consideration needed.	Further consideration required for flooding issues	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites. Sites in the urban area should be considered before the Green Belt. As no urban sites have been considered this creates doubt that there are no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable is valid.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.	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 grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12, 23. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is covered in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is	None stated.	The issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.	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
				incorrectly classified only as "important"			of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	None stated.	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Local Plan Policy NE7, Core Strategy policy CS24) and should not be considered for development.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Local Plan Policy NE7, Core Strategy policy CS24) and should not be considered for development.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Local Plan Policy NE7, Core Strategy policy CS24) and should not be considered for development.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Local Plan Policy NE7, Core Strategy policy CS24) and should not be considered for development.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Special Protection Areas (including 400m buffer) was excluded to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are designated as "Important Bird Areas" and should also have buffers for the same reason.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Special Protection Areas (including 400m buffer) was excluded to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are designated as "Important Bird Areas" and should also have buffers for the same reason.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Special Protection Areas (including 400m buffer) was excluded to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are designated as "Important Bird Areas" and should also have buffers for the same reason.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Special Protection Areas (including 400m buffer) was excluded to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are designated as "Important Bird Areas" and should also have buffers for the same reason.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach, it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then recommending land that contained constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The matter is 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach, it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then recommending land that contained constraints (Mayford included). The Report 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach, it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then recommending land that contained constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach, it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then recommending land that contained constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						back of the Core Strategy.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the 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 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Mayford is a key area for the 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 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the 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 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Mayford is a key area for the 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 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development."	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need –	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”			
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances” – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances” – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	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 Section 1. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs. This matter has been address by the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on field either side later.	None stated.	The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on field either side later.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on field either side later.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on field either side later.	None stated.	There is no ambiguity in the Council's proposal for the site at Egley Road. The site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school has the benefit of planning approval. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment - this questions the validity of the Review and suggests areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment - this questions the validity of the Review and suggests areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment - this questions the validity of the Review and suggests areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment - this questions the validity of the Review and suggests areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 7. The lancape implications of the proposals have been fully taken into account.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and	No further modification is 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. 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.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	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	No further modification is 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 there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. If successful, will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of the SSSI and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to enable this objective to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. If successful, will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of the SSSI and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to enable this objective to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. If successful, will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of the SSSI and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to enable this objective to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. If successful, will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of the SSSI and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to enable this objective to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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	No further modification is 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 there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated	The Council is satisfied that the proposals can be developed without undermining the identity and separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings. Travellers business activities are out of keeping.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and there are virtually no facilities in the Mayford village precinct.	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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to the edge of the urban area with good access to jobs, infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	None stated.	The 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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Accept that a secondary school on this site represents a special purpose for which Green Belt land can be ascribed and am supportive of school proposal including mitigations for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, safety measures for students and public alike, flooding and run-off mitigation	None stated.	The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated	Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated	Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated	Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated	The ownership of land has not influenced the Council's decisions. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 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
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
154	Beverley	Digby-Jones	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAABW019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character.  With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.  The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
397	Victoria	Diprose	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 developed for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI. The site is used by residents for leisure purposes. An increase of traveller pitches on the site will increase the risk to wildlife	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	Object to GB7. Woking's Traveller sites are focussed in this part of the Borough. Mayford already provides a major contribution and there is no justification for further expansion.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	GB land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. The whole purpose of the GB is to prevent neighbouring towns merging	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	GB land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. The whole purpose of the GB is to prevent neighbouring	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
				towns merging			
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	GB land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. The whole purpose of the GB is to prevent neighbouring towns merging	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	GB land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. The whole purpose of the GB is to prevent neighbouring towns merging	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchingtan, 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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. 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7:</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
397	Victoria	Diprose	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. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0. 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0  In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0. 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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.	<p>This representation 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition</p>	No further modification is 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>Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed 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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The 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. It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential. Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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. It is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential. Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.	
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB8	There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station.	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 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB9	There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station.	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 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
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB10	There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the	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
				transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station.		The 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.	of this representation
397	Victoria	Diprose	GB11	There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station.	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
397	Victoria	Diprose	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
657	Ewelinka	Dochan	GB12	Shocked and outraged about building houses on the Green Belt - destroying valuable farming space and free wild life.	None stated.	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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 proposed number of dwellings provides an indication of what could be achieved on each of the proposed sites. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities and number of dwellings are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. The actual number of dwellings on each site will 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 and fewer number of dwellings could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
657	Ewelinka	Dochan	GB13	Shocked and outraged about building houses on the Green Belt - destroying valuable farming space and free wild life.	None stated.	<p>The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between 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> <p>The proposed number of dwellings provides an indication of what could be achieved on each of the proposed sites. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities and number of dwellings are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. The actual number of dwellings on each site will 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 and fewer number of dwellings could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
657	Ewelinka	Dochan	GB12	Development would have a negative impact on the character of the village and make it a depressed town. House prices will fall as a result and access to green spaces for local people will reduce.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure 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
						<p>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. There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site will result in a negative impact on local property values. The Council has a number of planning policies which will ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area. This includes CS21 of the Core Strategy as well as best practice guidance set out in the Design SPD. 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 key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.</p>	
657	Ewelinka	Dochan	GB13	Development would have a negative impact on the character of the village and make it a depressed town. House prices will fall as a result and access to green spaces for local people will reduce.	None stated.	<p>The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure 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. There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site will result in a negative impact on local property values. The Council has a number of planning policies which will ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area. This includes CS21 of the Core Strategy as well as best practice guidance set out in the Design SPD. 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 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
977	W	Dochan	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Will negatively affect wildlife. Would destroy the village character of Pyrford.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>This representation regarding the character of the village and the impact on amenity and well being has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	
977	W	Dochan	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Will negatively affect wildlife. Would destroy the village character of Pyrford.	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. This representation regarding the character of the village and the impact on amenity and well being has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
977	W	Dochan	GB12	Will negatively impact existing infrastructure including schools and healthcare. Pressure for parking at rail stations will increase as the local bus service is poor.	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Core Strategy highlights that sustainable methods of travel will be encouraged and promoted. As part of this strategy, the introduction and expansion of the Cycle Hub at Woking Station as well as the proposal for a Transport Interchange at Woking Station (Site UA23) should encourage sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Nevertheless the existing bus service provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
977	W	Dochan	GB13	Will negatively impact existing infrastructure including schools and healthcare. Pressure for parking at rail stations will increase as the local bus service is poor.	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 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 Core Strategy highlights that sustainable methods of travel will be encouraged and promoted. As part of this strategy, the introduction and expansion of the Cycle Hub at Woking Station as well as the proposal for a Transport Interchange at Woking Station (Site UA23) should encourage sustainable transport options. Nevertheless the existing bus service provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
977	W	Dochan	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. And could result in further accidents and deaths. 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 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 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. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
977	W	Dochan	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. And could result in further accidents and deaths. 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 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</p>	No further modification is 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. 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. 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.	
977	W	Dochan	GB12	Focus should be building on brownfield sites, for example Boundary Road, and not removing Green Belt. WTC commercial schemes should incorporate residential units on their upper floors.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered a wide range of sites throughout the Borough to meet development needs. Nevertheless the suggested sites are noted. The site suggested on Boundary Road is allocated within the Site Allocations DPD, see site UA35. This site is considered to be suitable for industrial purposes as it is located within the Monument Way West Industrial Estate and will contribute towards the economic strategy of the Borough.</p> <p>The suggestion for mixed used development is also noted. The Council is proposing to allocate over 25 sites for mixed use development in the existing urban areas, see sites UA1 to UA52. Many of these, particularly in the main centres such as Woking Town Centre, are high density mixed use developments of retail, offices and residential accommodation.</p> <p>As part of the SHLAA, the Council has carried out an assessment of the existing urban area to identify sites that are both developable and available for redevelopment. Both the hotel near to Woking Station and the Lion Retail Park did not meet this criteria as they are in operational use and address a local need.</p> <p>The SHLAA is available on the Council's website as well as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that assessed a number of sites in the urban area.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
977	W	Dochan	GB13	Focus should be building on brownfield sites, for example Boundary Road, and not removing Green Belt. WTC commercial schemes should incorporate residential units on their upper floors.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered a wide range of sites throughout the Borough to meet development needs. Nevertheless the suggested sites are noted. The site suggested on Boundary Road is allocated within the Site Allocations DPD, see site UA35. This site is considered to be suitable for industrial purposes as it is located within the Monument Way West Industrial Estate and will contribute towards the economic strategy of the Borough. The suggestion for mixed used development is also noted. The Council is proposing to allocate over 25 sites for mixed use development in the existing urban areas, see sites UA1 to UA52. Many of these, particularly in the main centres such as Woking Town Centre, are high density mixed use developments of retail, offices and residential accommodation. As part of the SHLAA, the Council has carried out an assessment of the existing urban area to identify sites that are both developable and available for redevelopment. Both the hotel near to Woking Station and the Lion Retail Park did not meet this criteria as they are in operational use and address a local need. The SHLAA is available on the Council's website as well as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that assessed a number of sites in the urban area. The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	West Byfleet will lose 80-90% of its Green Belt. Suggests developing Broadoaks as residential and not developing the West Hall site.	Develop Broadoaks as residential and leave the West Hall site.	<p>The Council is proposing that both sites be allocated to meet future development need.</p> <p>There is current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school and residential development on the site. This is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	West Byfleet will lose 80-90% of its Green Belt. Suggests developing Broadoaks as residential and not developing the West Hall site.	Develop Broadoaks as residential and leave the West Hall site.	The Council is proposing that both sites be allocated to meet future development need.  There is current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school and residential development on the site. This is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Questions if brownfield sites could used instead of Green Belt land.	None stated.	Broadoaks is designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. Green Belt policies therefore apply to any development scheme proposed on the site.  Nevertheless the Council has allocated the site in the draft DPD for primarily employment uses with some residential development. This is set out in site GB16. This site, as also noted in the Core Strategy, is an important employment site within the Borough and will have a significant role in helping to achieve the economic strategy of the Borough.  In addition, the Council has identified over 50 sites in the Site Allocations DPD in the urban area for development. This is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Questions if brownfield sites could used instead of Green Belt land.	None stated.	Broadoaks is designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. Green Belt policies therefore apply to any development scheme proposed on the site.  Nevertheless the Council has allocated the site in the draft DPD for primarily employment uses with some residential development. This is set out in site GB16. This site, as also noted in the Core Strategy, is an important employment site within the Borough and will have a significant role in helping to achieve the economic strategy of the Borough.  In addition, the Council has identified over 50 sites in the Site Allocations DPD in the urban area for development. This is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Traffic will significantly affect air quality.	None stated.	With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air quality	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Traffic will significantly affect air quality.	None stated.	With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air quality	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Medical facilities are already at capacity and further development will make the situation and resulting traffic worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Medical facilities are already at capacity and further development will make the situation and resulting traffic worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Developing the two sites will increase pollution levels and lock residents in the village.	None stated.	The Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.  The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise and ground contamination. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development of the site is sustainable.	
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Developing the two sites will increase pollution levels and lock residents in the village.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise and ground contamination. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	West Byfleet and surrounding areas have been allocated the majority of housing. This is unfair and development should be spread across 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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	West Byfleet and surrounding areas have been allocated the majority of housing. This is unfair and development should be spread across 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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Understands that land at West Hall was classified as sensitive but this was overturned to allow development proposals to be put forward. The West Hall site floods annually and should not be developed. Several sites in the area flood annually therefore there is not much land for excess water to go.	None stated.	<p>To clarify, none of the proposed site allocations are classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	There are no plans by SWT to expand West Byfleet rail services. Woking station is being prioritised with a view to West Byfleet users having to change at Woking. The rail station and services are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse and a potential health and safety issue.	None stated.	<p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	There are no plans by SWT to expand West Byfleet rail services. Woking station is being prioritised with a view to West Byfleet users having to change at Woking. The rail station and services are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse and a potential health and safety issue.	None stated.	<p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Local primary schools are already at capacity and further development will make the situation and resulting traffic worse. Questions how issues relating to demand and expansion constraints will be addressed.	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
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Local primary schools are already at capacity and further development will make the situation and resulting traffic worse. Questions how issues relating to demand and expansion constraints will be addressed.	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
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	A SCC traffic study conducted in 1990 stated the area could not take further development because the road network could not be expanded to cope with increased traffic levels. Traffic continued to increase and Parvis Road is already classified as 'F' for traffic. Although a lower rating is not available this isn't justification for development. The development of West Hall and a new school will make the traffic situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	A SCC traffic study conducted in 1990 stated the area could not take further development because the road network could not be expanded to cope with increased traffic levels. Traffic continued to increase and Parvis Road is already classified as 'F' for traffic. Although a lower rating is not available this isn't justification for development. The development of West Hall and a new school will make the traffic situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1049	James	Docherty	GB15	Questions if the current infrastructure will cope from an increased population. Also asks what impact on traffic will any resulting upgrades have.	None stated.	With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Questions if the current infrastructure will cope from an increased population. Also asks what impact on traffic will any resulting upgrades have.	None stated.	With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1049	James	Docherty	GB16	Several sites in the area flood annually therefore there is not much land for excess water to go.	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
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Green Belt loss - could Broadoaks not be developed solely as residential and West Hall not developed? West Byfleet will otherwise lose 80-90% of its Green Belt land. Could brownfield sites like Broadoaks be used instead of Green Belt to meet housing needs?	None stated.	The Council also has responsibility to meet the employment needs of the area. Presently, Broadoaks is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt for high quality offices use. The Site Allocations DPD extends the uses on the site to include residential. In addition, the West Hall proposal will still be needed to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Green Belt loss - could Broadoaks not be developed solely as residential and West Hall not developed? West Byfleet will otherwise lose 80-90% of its Green Belt land. Could brownfield sites like Broadoaks be used instead of Green Belt to meet housing needs?	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is proposing that Broadoaks be allocated for employment and residential use. The Council also has the responsibility for meeting the employment needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Traffic – we understand an earlier transport study of West Byfleet in the 1990s concluded the area should not be developed further as road infrastructure capacity could not be expanded. Traffic has increased since. Parvis Road is already at a standstill most mornings and evenings, the situation would only be made worse by West Hall and Broadoaks. There would be gridlock. Pollution levels would increase dramatically.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council has carried out an up to date transport assessment to inform the DPD (2015). A number of the data would have changed since 1990 and it is important that up to date data is used.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Traffic – we understand an earlier transport study of West Byfleet in the 1990s concluded the area should not be developed further as road infrastructure capacity could not be expanded. Traffic has increased since. Parvis Road is already at a standstill most mornings and evenings, the situation would only be made worse by West Hall and Broadoaks. There would be gridlock. Pollution levels would increase dramatically.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Public transport - Existing peak services are already full. South West Trains is not planning to expand services to West Byfleet. Rather development of Woking station is being prioritised. Platforms already at capacity, any significant increase could become a regular health and safety risk. Narrow platforms can not be widened.	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
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Public transport - Existing peak services are already full. South West Trains is not planning to expand services to West Byfleet. Rather development of Woking station is being prioritised. Platforms already at capacity, any significant increase could become a regular health and safety risk. Narrow platforms can not be widened.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Schools – a secondary school at Broadoaks would help but primary schools? The Infant/Junior School would need to increase their intake to 120 per year (x7) making the school a 840 pupil school. Already significant traffic issues around the school and the Marist School, morning and evening. What plans are in place to accommodate such an increase in size?	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 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
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Schools – a secondary school at Broadoaks would help but primary schools? The Infant/Junior School would need to increase their intake to 120 per year (x7) making the school a 840 pupil school. Already significant traffic issues around the school and the Marist School, morning and evening. What plans are in place to accommodate such an increase in size?	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 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
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Healthcare – appreciate healthcare is looked at on a wider basis than just the village but surgeries already at capacity, any increase in demand would have to be met on new sites (planned?) or residents would need to travel, impacting the road network and public transport.	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. As part of Transport 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 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.	
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Healthcare – appreciate healthcare is looked at on a wider basis than just the village but surgeries already at capacity, any increase in demand would have to be met on new sites (planned?) or residents would need to travel, impacting the road network and public transport.	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. As part of Transport 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 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
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Environmental – significant effect on air quality. Since construction of the M25, pasture land at West Hall floods each year. The land was classed as sensitive but the classification was overturned to allow proposals for development. Given flooding in Byfleet 2013/2014, it does not seem sensible to build close to 600 houses. There is little land for the excess water to go.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. The are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control pollution and air quality of any development proposals that will come forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Environmental – significant effect on air quality. Since construction of the M25, pasture land at West Hall floods each year. The land was classed as sensitive but the classification was overturned to allow proposals for development. Given flooding in Byfleet 2013/2014, it does not seem sensible to build close to 600 houses. There is little land for the excess water to go.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. The are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control pollution and air quality of any development proposals that will come forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	Utilities – will infrastructure cope with the increased population? If upgrades are needed, what impact will this have on local traffic and for how long?	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	Utilities – will infrastructure cope with the increased population? If upgrades are needed, what impact will this have on local traffic and for how long?	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						working with the 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.	
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB15	We strongly object for the following reasons: Fairness - with development proposed in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford, this small corner of the Borough would bear the brunt. Fairer to spread around than concentrate.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Because of the existing constraint in Woking, the Council has to identify sites in sustainable locations. Based on the available evidence, the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1071	Vanessa	Docherty	GB16	We strongly object for the following reasons: Fairness - with development proposed in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford, this small corner of the Borough would bear the brunt. Fairer to spread around than concentrate.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Because of the existing constraint in Woking, the Council has to identify sites in sustainable locations. The proposals are considered the most sustainable when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1513	Geoff, Denise	Doe	GB2	Objects to the proposal to increase the site's capacity beyond the 15 already approved. The current level of occupation is the maximum recommended in Government guidelines. Any further increase will be detrimental for both the gypsy community and the Brookwood community as a whole.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0 and 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1513	Geoff, Denise	Doe	GB3	Objects to the proposal to increase the site's capacity beyond the 15 already approved. The current level of occupation is the maximum recommended in Government guidelines. Any further increase will be detrimental for both the gypsy community and the Brookwood community as a whole.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0 and 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1513	Geoff, Denise	Doe	GB2	Your latest document considers the area as two sites, however history and precedent, including your own policy from December 2013 considers this to be one 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
1513	Geoff, Denise	Doe	GB3	Your latest document considers the area as two sites, however history and precedent, including your own policy from December 2013 considers this to be one 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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.	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will	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
				become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.		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.	
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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.	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB8	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB9	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB10	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB11	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						biodiversity 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).	
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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.</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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	<p>The representation on openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The representation on the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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. 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and	Please reconsider	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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

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	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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	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.  This representation has also 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	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.  This representation has also 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	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. This representation has also 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
900	Rachel	Doling Thacker	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	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.  This representation has also 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
399	I	Donalon	GB13	Special circumstances has not been demonstrated for the release of GB land. It does not appear that brownfield sites have been exhausted first.	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been 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
399	I	Donalon	GB12	Special circumstances has not been demonstrated for the release of GB land. It does not appear that brownfield sites have been exhausted first.	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB12	Concerned the proposals for the borough are being concentrated in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet and has not been spread evenly throughout the borough.  In addition Guildford Borough are proposing a significant size development that will add to the potential impact on Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB13	Concerned the proposals for the borough are being concentrated in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet and has not been spread evenly throughout the borough.  In addition Guildford Borough are proposing a significant size development that will add to the potential impact on Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						therefore relatively modest.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	
399	I	Donalon	GB12	The Council has ignored recommendations of the GBBR in relation to Pyrford. Why?	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
399	I	Donalon	GB13	The Council has ignored recommendations of the GBBR in relation to Pyrford. Why?	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
399	I	Donalon	GB12	It appears that WBC have ignored representations from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. It is unacceptable to make decisions without reviewing all evidence and representations	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015, responses were provided at the meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB13	It appears that WBC have ignored representations from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. It is unacceptable to make decisions without reviewing all evidence and representations	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015, responses were provided at the meeting and these were minuted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB13	Other infrastructure will be adversely affected. The schools, health services are oversubscribed. Trains are over used. The infrastructure is already strained and cannot cope with additional demand	None stated.	Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB12	Other infrastructure will be adversely affected. The schools, health services are oversubscribed. Trains are over used. The infrastructure is already strained and cannot cope with additional demand	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. This includes reference to education provision in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
399	I	Donalon	GB12	The character and charm of Pyrford is important to its residents. The removal of the two parcels in Pyrford will have a detrimental effect on its special character. A decision on the sites cannot be made without taking into consideration recommendations from evidence base and representations from local Forums	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 23.0 and 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. The key requirements for the proposal also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB13	The character and charm of Pyrford is important to its residents. The removal of the two parcels in Pyrford will have a detrimental effect on its special character. A decision on the sites cannot be made without taking into consideration recommendations from evidence base and representations from local Forums	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 23.0 and 7.0.  Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.  The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features  The key requirements for the proposal also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB13	Concerned that the infrastructure will not cope with the additional development. Pyrford already suffers from congestion and is a 'rat run' between areas. The proposals and additional proposals in Guildford will adversely impact traffic in the area	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The various transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
399	I	Donalon	GB12	Concerned that the infrastructure will not cope with the additional development. Pyrford already suffers from congestion and is a 'rat run' between areas. The proposals and additional proposals in Guildford will adversely impact	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; 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	No further modification is 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 in the area		be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
712	Christine	Dougherty	General	The Health Centre, the Junior School, The Railway Station and getting into and out of West Byfleet is very hard now. Please don't make it worse.	None stated.	Noted. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, the Council is committed to working with the County Highways Agency and other relevant stakeholders to improve the road network where possible. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
712	Christine	Dougherty	Cumulative impacts	The traffic on Parvis Road makes the road unusable which will have an impact on businesses, schools, trade, etc. This will be worse with new developments.	Encourage traffic to go through oyster lane to Woodham Road and then to Woking maybe, but not ideal.	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 note the suggestion to improve traffic congestion in West Byfleet. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
712	Christine	Dougherty	GB16	The A245 will be worse with additional houses. Until the road issues and safety are addressed, WBC should not consider further development. The health centre should be increase, station platforms extended and schools doubled in size. West Byfleet will be ruined if this is not carried out.	Any development to Broadoaks should have a in andout road to the Oaks and not on Parvis Road, 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. 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	No further modification is 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 not happen. There should be huge new health centre next to the Nuffield Gym in Pyrford, the present health centre a car park for Waitrose which is now a nightmare to get into.	<p>Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The proposed modification to develop a health centre off Pyrford Road will result in more Green Belt land being used for development. The Core Strategy states that the Green Belt is a broad location of growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. This proposed modification is not for residential uses and therefore would conflict with the Core Strategy and would need to be assessed through the Development Management process based on its own merits. The representation regarding rail capacity issues has been noted by the Council and 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 is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator in identifying capacity issues and future projects at the Borough's stations. The representation regarding school places has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of West Byfleet. 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. The Council notes the proposed modifications. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding access to The Oaks. The proposed modification regarding removing West Hall from the Site Allocations DPD has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing access and parking issues at Waitrose have been considered under Site UA51, which seeks to deliver the comprehensive redevelopment of this part of West Byfleet District Centre and improvements to car parking and access. The proposed modification to include land in Pyrford for development needs has been considered by the Council. The site is not suitable for development based on the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	
712	Christine	Dougherty	Pathways of Impact	WBC must listen to people who live in West Byfleet. The development is opposed by local people and should not proceed unless all actions are justified.	There is nothing to be done with Parvis Road, and WBC must not make a very bad situation worse.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD has been through Regulation 18 consultation. Each representation received has been addressed by the Council and modifications to the document will be made before it is published for Regulation 19 consultation. The community will be able to comment on the updated document again at this stage before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination.</p> <p>The justification for Green Belt development has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The proposed modification has been addressed in Section 3.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	Concerned about the use of the sports complex seven days a week, into the evening, due to potential for noise from traffic, loud speakers and also light pollution issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB9	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB10	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB11	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	Concerned about drainage in the area. The school and sports area's significant size will reduce natural drainage, even if further drainage pipes are installed.	None stated.	These issues have been addressed in the planning application (granted) for school and leisure centre proposal at the site. This can be found on the Council's website, planning reference PLAN/2015/0703. The representation is further addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	Questions the need for a sports complex with Woking Leisure centre close by and Guildford facilities not far away. Also, a running track could have been easily accommodated at Goldsworth Park, which already has some facilities that could have been expanded more cheaply than building this new facility.	Suggests Goldsworth Park as a better location for a new sports complex.	These issues have been addressed in the planning application (granted) for school and leisure centre proposal at the site. This can be found on the Council's website, planning reference PLAN/2015/0703. Part of the reason for locating the running track at this site is that it plays a role in supporting the sports needs of the school, as well as providing a new leisure facility for the local community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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	No further modification is 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).	
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB9	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB10	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB11	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB9	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB10	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB11	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1454	Nigel	Douglas	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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 Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site	No further modification is 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 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.	
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Concerned about the use of the sports complex seven days a week, into the evening, due to potential for noise from traffic, loud speakers and also light pollution issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB9	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB10	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB11	Concerned about drainage in the area.	None stated.	This representation is comprehensively addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Concerned about drainage in the area. The school and sports area's significant size will reduce natural drainage, even if further drainage pipes are installed.	None stated.	These issues have been addressed in the planning application (granted) for school and leisure centre proposal at the site. This can be found on the Council's website, planning reference PLAN/2015/0703. The representation is further addressed in Section 5.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Questions the need for a sports complex with Woking Leisure centre close by and Guildford facilities not far away. Also, a running track could have been easily accommodated at Goldsworth Park, which already has some facilities that could have been expanded more cheaply than building this new facility.	Suggests Goldsworth Park as a better location for a new sports complex.	These issues have been addressed in the planning application (granted) for school and leisure centre proposal at the site. This can be found on the Council's website, planning reference PLAN/2015/0703. Part of the reason for locating the running track at this site is that it plays a role in supporting the sports needs of the school, as well as providing a new leisure facility for the local community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB9	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.		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).	
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB10	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB11	Little consideration has been given to wildlife. 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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB9	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB10	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB11	Believes the traffic issues associated with these projects have been seriously underestimated.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	Questions the need for a sports complex with Woking Leisure centre close by and Guildford facilities not far away. Also, a running track could have been easily accommodated at Goldsworth Park, which already has some facilities that could have been expanded more cheaply than building this new facility.	Suggests Goldsworth Park as a better location for a new sports complex.	These issues have been addressed in the planning application (granted) for school and leisure centre proposal at the site. This can be found on the Council's website, planning reference PLAN/2015/0703. Part of the reason for locating the running track at this site is that it plays a role in supporting the sports needs of the school, as well as providing a new leisure facility for the local community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	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	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:	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.		Green Belt.	
1455	Irene	Douglas	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
1455	Irene	Douglas	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (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. There is inadequate car parking at Worplesdon station, which will not be able to cope, and the bus service in the area is pathetic.	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
89	David	Dowling	General	The Green Belt generally should be viewed as sacrosanct and not be encroached on at all - full stop. We have already seen that Woking Borough Council fails to adhere to it's own guidance, the case of the White Hart, Old Woking, shows not only the loss of an historical function but also building on floodplains.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
89	David	Dowling	General	Will there be any notification of fun provided to political parties from developers and other interested parties in the event that these developments take place?	None stated.	Political parties will not receive any funding on the back of the proposals in the DPD. The Council will however secure developer contributions where justified to deliver infrastructure to support the proposed development. That process is transparent and has been part of the planning process for many years.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	The document has an inadequate evidence base, concentrating on which parts of Woking's Green Belt should be released. There is no thorough study to ensure consideration of all brownfield sites, and lack of consideration given to the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and relative consequences of pursuing	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				different options. There are a number of inconsistencies in the application of assessment criteria, with too much weight given to 'deliverability' based on short term availability, and not enough given to suitability of sites. It appears that potential landowner/ developer profits rate higher than impact on local residents. Several important baseline studies are missing from the assessment, particularly an up to date Lancap Character Assessment and Conservation Area Appraisals. This has resulted in lancap and heritage characteristics being missed, which would have influenced the outcome of the assessment.			
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	The document has an inadequate evidence base, concentrating on which parts of Woking's Green Belt should be released. There is no thorough study to ensure consideration of all brownfield sites, and lack of consideration given to the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and relative consequences of pursuing different options. There are a number of inconsistencies in the application of assessment criteria, with too much weight given to 'deliverability' based on short term availability, and not enough given to suitability of sites. It appears that potential landowner/ developer profits rate higher than impact on local residents. Several important baseline studies are missing from the assessment, particularly an up to date Lancap Character Assessment and Conservation Area Appraisals. This has resulted in lancap and heritage characteristics being missed, which would have influenced the outcome of the assessment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The document has an inadequate evidence base, concentrating on which parts of Woking's Green Belt should be released. There is no thorough study to ensure consideration of all brownfield sites, and lack of consideration given to the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and relative consequences of pursuing different options. There are a number of inconsistencies in the application of assessment criteria, with too much weight given to 'deliverability' based on short term availability, and not enough given to suitability of sites. It appears that potential landowner/ developer profits rate higher than impact on local residents. Several important baseline studies are missing from the assessment, particularly an up to date Lancap Character Assessment and Conservation Area Appraisals. This has resulted in lancap and heritage characteristics being missed, which would have influenced the outcome of the assessment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	There is a general lack of broad strategic thinking. This includes consideration of the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and coherent thinking about sustainable development and prevention of piecemeal, incremental growth. Long term strategic decisions about housing needs and looking beyond the borough boundaries, for sites and in considering impacts (e.g. on Wisley treatment plant) are missing from the document. Impact of massive traffic increase from the south, passing through Pyrford on its way to West Byfleet station, Health Centre and shops needs to be accounted for.	None stated.	The Council's Core Strategy contains the strategic thinking and general approach to sustainable development referred to here (see particularly its spatial vision in Section 3.0 and policy CS1: A spatial strategy for Woking Borough). The Core Strategy is referenced in the introduction to this DPD. The Site Allocations DPD delivers the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, and puts forward sites for the delivery of its development requirements. In this sense the DPD has a broader strategic framework and has not been produced in isolation. It has also been produced in consultation with neighbouring boroughs, including Guildford, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2. Section 24.0 of this paper addresses the issue of cross-boundary transport matters.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	There is a general lack of broad strategic thinking. This includes consideration of the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and coherent thinking about sustainable development and prevention of piecemeal, incremental	None stated.	The Council's Core Strategy contains the strategic thinking and general approach to sustainable development referred to here (see particularly its spatial vision in Section 3.0 and policy CS1: A spatial strategy for Woking Borough). The Core Strategy is referenced in the introduction to this DPD. The Site Allocations DPD delivers the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, and puts forward sites for the delivery of its development requirements. 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
				growth. Long term strategic decisions about housing needs and looking beyond the borough boundaries, for sites and in considering impacts (e.g. on Wisley treatment plant) are missing from the document. Impact of massive traffic increase from the south, passing through Pyrford on its way to West Byfleet station, Health Centre and shops needs to be accounted for.		this sense the DPD has a broader strategic framework and has not been produced in isolation. It has also been produced in consultation with neighbouring boroughs, including Guildford, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2. Section 24.0 of this paper addresses the issue of cross-boundary transport matters.	
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	There is a general lack of broad strategic thinking. This includes consideration of the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt, and coherent thinking about sustainable development and prevention of piecemeal, incremental growth. Long term strategic decisions about housing needs and looking beyond the borough boundaries, for sites and in considering impacts (e.g. on Wisley treatment plant) are missing from the document. Impact of massive traffic increase from the south, passing through Pyrford on its way to West Byfleet station, Health Centre and shops needs to be accounted for.	None stated.	The Council's Core Strategy contains the strategic thinking and general approach to sustainable development referred to here (see particularly its spatial vision in Section 3.0 and policy CS1: A spatial strategy for Woking Borough). The Core Strategy is referenced in the introduction to this DPD. The Site Allocations DPD delivers the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, and puts forward sites for the delivery of its development requirements. In this sense the DPD has a broader strategic framework and has not been produced in isolation. It has also been produced in consultation with neighbouring boroughs, including Guildford, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2. Section 24.0 of this paper addresses the issue of cross-boundary transport matters.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	There has been a lack of substantive public consultation. There was no public consultation about the decision in 2013 to appoint external consultants and their terms of reference. Disagrees with the Council's website which states that the Green Belt Review will not be subject to any form of public consultation and states that the review exercise has been characterised by cavalier disregard for the wishes of the public. Two letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum expressing concern about the GBR have been ignored, and offers by the Forum and their advisers LDA Design to address Borough Executive were rebuffed by the Executive, who proceeded to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum objected to the Borough's approach, as have their advisers.	None stated.	As set out in Section 10.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Peter Brett Associates were commissioned to carry out the Green Belt boundary review. This document is one of a series of documents that makes up the Council's evidence base. As per national planning regulations and the Council's procurement procedure, the Council is not required to debate in public who it appoints to carry out evidence base reports or their terms of reference. The Green Belt boundary review is not required to be published for public consultation as it does not set policy or allocate sites. Its purpose is to make recommendations to the Council. Again it should be made clear that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Section 8.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper explains this in more detail.  As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representer ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	There has been a lack of substantive public consultation. There was no public consultation about the decision in 2013 to appoint external consultants and their terms of reference. Disagrees with the Council's website which states that the Green Belt Review will not be subject to any form of public consultation and states that the review exercise has been characterised by cavalier disregard for the wishes of the public. Two letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum expressing concern about the GBR have been ignored, and offers by the Forum and their advisers LDA Design to address Borough Executive were rebuffed by the Executive, who proceeded to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum objected to the Borough's approach, as have their advisers.	None stated.	As set out in Section 10.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Peter Brett Associates were commissioned to carry out the Green Belt boundary review. This document is one of a series of documents that makes up the Council's evidence base. As per national planning regulations and the Council's procurement procedure, the Council is not required to debate in public who it appoints to carry out evidence base reports or their terms of reference. The Green Belt boundary review is not required to be published for public consultation as it does not set policy or allocate sites. Its purpose is to make recommendations to the Council. Again it should be made clear that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Section 8.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper explains this in more detail. As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representer ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	There has been a lack of substantive public consultation. There was no public consultation about the decision in 2013 to appoint external consultants and their terms of reference. Disagrees with the Council's website which states that the Green Belt Review will not be subject to any form of public consultation and states that the review exercise has been characterised by cavalier disregard for the wishes of the public. Two letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum expressing concern about the GBR have been ignored, and offers by the Forum and their advisers LDA Design to address Borough Executive were	None stated.	As set out in Section 10.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Peter Brett Associates were commissioned to carry out the Green Belt boundary review. This document is one of a series of documents that makes up the Council's evidence base. As per national planning regulations and the Council's procurement procedure, the Council is not required to debate in public who it appoints to carry out evidence base reports or their terms of reference. The Green Belt boundary review is not required to be published for public consultation as it does not set policy or allocate sites. Its purpose is to make recommendations to the Council. Again it should be made clear that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Section 8.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper explains this in more detail.  As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				rebuffed by the Executive, who proceeded to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum objected to the Borough's approach, as have their advisors.		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.	
573	Martin	Doyle	General	Insufficient regard has been given to local issues, particularly the consequences of building in the Green Belt, and need to increase infrastructure capacity in advance of large developments. This has been raised time and again at public meetings and in response to questionnaires. Narrow local roads are already congested, and utilities (e.g. water and sewerage) are already at full stretch. Nursery, pre-school and primary schools are already at full capacity. This will be worsened by new development, and traffic in the central village area worsened by new houses over the borough boundary.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Insufficient regard has been given to local issues, particularly the consequences of building in the Green Belt, and need to increase infrastructure capacity in advance of large developments. This has been raised time and again at public meetings and in response to questionnaires. Narrow local roads are already congested, and utilities (e.g. water and sewerage) are already at full stretch. Nursery, pre-school and primary schools are already at full capacity. This will be worsened by new development, and traffic in the central village area worsened by new houses over the borough boundary.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Insufficient regard has been given to local issues, particularly the consequences of building in the Green Belt, and need to increase infrastructure capacity in advance of large developments. This has been raised time and again at public meetings and in response to questionnaires. Narrow local roads are already congested, and utilities (e.g. water and sewerage) are already at full stretch. Nursery, pre-school and primary schools are already at full capacity. This will be worsened by new development, and traffic in the central village area worsened by new houses over the borough boundary.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Concludes that the village is a place where people want to live because of its pleasant environment, character and safety. Once destroyed this cannot easily be recreated. The proposed 433 houses will lead to wholesale change to the character of the village, and is not appropriate. It is the whole local housing solution.	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
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Concludes that the village is a place where people want to live because of its pleasant environment, character and safety. Once destroyed this cannot easily be recreated. The proposed 433 houses will lead to wholesale change to the character of the village, and is not appropriate. It is the whole local housing solution.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						assessed 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.	
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	The DPD's evidence base should be re-examined so it accords with the suitability assessment. The final document needs also to develop a structured and strategic approach to infrastructure impacts of releasing Green Belt sites for future housing development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The DPD's evidence base should be re-examined so it accords with the suitability assessment. The final document needs also to develop a structured and strategic approach to infrastructure impacts of releasing Green Belt sites for future housing development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	Objects to the document on a number of grounds (each recorded separately). The DPD is a brave and valiant attempt to ensure sufficient land is identified to meet housing needs, but is seriously flawed as it failed to carry out a comprehensive review of the nature and sustainability of Woking's Green Belt. It also recommends site allocations without sufficient justification, often conflicting with its own evidence base and with community representations. The report [and its proposals] would seriously worsen existing infrastructure problems at a number of selected sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 3.0, 6.0, 9.0 and 10.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Objects to the document on a number of grounds (each recorded separately). The DPD is a brave and valiant attempt to ensure sufficient land is identified to meet housing needs, but is seriously flawed as it failed to carry out a comprehensive review of the nature and sustainability of Woking's Green Belt. It also recommends site allocations without sufficient justification, often conflicting with its own evidence base and with community representations. The report [and its proposals] would seriously worsen existing infrastructure problems at a number of selected sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 3.0, 6.0, 9.0 and 10.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Objects to the document on a number of grounds (each recorded separately). The DPD is a brave and valiant attempt to ensure sufficient land is identified to meet housing needs, but is seriously flawed as it failed to carry out a comprehensive review of the nature and sustainability of Woking's Green Belt. It also recommends site allocations without sufficient justification, often conflicting with its own evidence base and with community representations. The report [and its proposals] would seriously worsen existing infrastructure problems at a number of selected sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 3.0, 6.0, 9.0 and 10.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	A six week consultation period is inadequate for residents to become fully aware of the proposals. Concerned that many residents do not know about the consultation or its implications. Most information has only be accessible on the internet, disenfranchising a significant number of residents, particularly the senior generation who have no internet connection. The consultation should have been displayed widely in libraries, discussed in public meetings and provided house by house. While this has been rectified in some areas, it has been done by volunteers and residents associations, and all forced to be within the very tight six week deadline.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.</p> <p>The Council recognises that not all residents have access to the internet. Therefore the documents were made available in the Borough's libraries for the entire consultation period. In addition to this, banners were put up at Woking Library highlighting the consultation event, as well as leaflets distributed at several of the Borough's retail areas and train stations. Council Officers also attended several community meetings across the Borough as well as held an open day at Civic Offices to enable members of the public to speak to officers directly.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough. It was therefore not possible to carry out a direct house to house approach as the proposed sites cover a significant proportion of the Borough and in total, there are around 46,000 dwellings in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council had highlighted to community groups such as Resident Associations and Neighbourhood Forums that Officers would attend meetings in their local community's if requested. This took place in several areas of the Borough, including Mayford, West Byfleet</p>	No further modification is 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 Byfleet.	
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	A six week consultation period is inadequate for residents to become fully aware of the proposals. Concerned that many residents do not know about the consultation or its implications. Most information has only be accessible on the internet, disenfranchising a significant number of residents, particularly the senior generation who have no internet connection. The consultation should have been displayed widely in libraries, discussed in public meetings and provided house by house. While this has been rectified in some areas, it has been done by volunteers and residents associations, and all forced to be within the very tight six week deadline.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.</p> <p>The Council recognises that not all residents have access to the internet. Therefore the documents were made available in the Borough's libraries for the entire consultation period. In addition to this, banners were put up at Woking Library highlighting the consultation event, as well as leaflets distributed at several of the Borough's retail areas and train stations. Council Officers also attended several community meetings across the Borough as well as held an open day at Civic Offices to enable members of the public to speak to officers directly.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough. It was therefore not possible to carry out a direct house to house approach as the proposed sites cover a significant proportion of the Borough and in total, there are around 46,000 dwellings in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council had highlighted to community groups such as Resident Associations and Neighbourhood Forums that Officers would attend meetings in their local community's if requested. This took place in several areas of the Borough, including Mayford, West Byfleet and Byfleet.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	A six week consultation period is inadequate for residents to become fully aware of the proposals. Concerned that many residents do not know about the consultation or its implications. Most information has only be accessible on the internet, disenfranchising a significant number of residents, particularly the senior generation who have no internet connection. The consultation should have been displayed widely in libraries, discussed in public meetings and provided house by house. While this has been rectified in some areas, it has been done by volunteers and residents associations, and all forced to be within the very tight six week deadline.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The Council recognises that not all residents have access to the internet. Therefore the documents were made available in the Borough's libraries for the entire consultation period. In addition to this, banners were put up at Woking Library highlighting the consultation event, as well as leaflets distributed at several of the Borough's retail areas and train stations. Council Officers also attended several community meetings across the Borough as well as held an open day at Civic Offices to enable members of the public to speak to officers directly. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate over 70 sites across the Borough. It was therefore not possible to carry out a direct house to house approach as the proposed sites cover a significant proportion of the Borough and in total, there are around 46,000 dwellings in the Borough. The Council had highlighted to community groups such as Resident Associations and Neighbourhood Forums that Officers would attend meetings in their local community's if requested. This took place in several areas of the Borough, including Mayford, West Byfleet and Byfleet.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum question significant parts of the GBR and WBC officers have rejected some of its findings, shown by the addition of site GB13.	None stated.	<p>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. In terms of how the findings of the Green Belt Boundary Review have been used by the Council in the preparation of the draft DPD, please see Section 17.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum question significant parts of the GBR and WBC officers have rejected some of its findings, shown by the addition of site GB13. The GBR judged site GB13 as unsuitable for release from the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>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. In terms of how the findings of the Green Belt Boundary Review have been used by the Council in the preparation of the draft DPD, please see Section 17.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Outlines comments in attached letter (recorded and summarised separately): 1. A review of Green Belt Review methodology and its application; 2. Review of the suitability of the 'preferred parcels'; 3. Review of technical constraints of sites 9a and 9b; 4. Consideration of how urban areas, like Woking, could be properly planned to encourage sustainable development and prevent incremental growth; 5. A review of the Site Allocations DPD and underpinning evidence in the SA; 6. Summary.	None stated.	Comments noted and each one will be addressed appropriately.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Outlines comments in attached letter (recorded and summarised separately): 1. A review of Green Belt Review methodology and its application; 2. Review of the suitability of the 'preferred parcels'; 3. Review of technical constraints of sites 9a and 9b; 4. Consideration of how urban areas, like Woking, could be properly planned to encourage sustainable development and prevent incremental growth; 5. A review of the Site Allocations DPD and underpinning evidence in the SA; 6. Summary.	None stated.	Comments noted and each one will be addressed appropriately.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Contends that the Green Belt Review should form part of the formal suite of Regulation 18 documents for consultation. Comments relate to the process of identifying sites the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and GBR. Notes that the consultation process does not provide for comments to be made on the GBR, but that the evidence base for the SA is intrinsically linked to the GBR, which provides the only technical review of suitability of sites for release from the Green Belt. The GBR is the only logical document for WBC to draw their evidence and specific, detailed assessments, including constraints and suitability, to enable site by site decisions to be made.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review is one of a number of evidence base studies that has been used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. Details of the scale of evidence used to inform the DPD is addressed in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the Council is satisfied that the evidence justifies the allocation of GB12 and GB13. Whilst the Council is not publishing any of its evidence base for consultation, any points raised about any of the evidence as part of the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation has been addressed. The Council is satisfied that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust, founded on a sound methodology and the methodology has consistently been applied throughout the study. This particular issue 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
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The Green Belt Review should form part of the formal suite of Regulation 18 documents for consultation. Comments relate to the process of identifying sites the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and GBR. Notes that the consultation process does not provide for comments to be made on the GBR, but that the evidence base for the SA is intrinsically linked to the GBR, which provides the only technical review of suitability of sites for release from the Green Belt. The GBR is the only logical document for WBC to draw their evidence and specific, detailed assessments, including constraints and suitability, to enable site by site decisions to be made.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review is one of a number of evidence base studies that has been used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. Details of the scale of evidence used to inform the DPD is addressed in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the Council is satisfied that the evidence justifies the allocation of GB12 and GB13. Whilst the Council is not publishing any of its evidence base for consultation, any points raised about any of the evidence as part of the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation has been addressed. The Council is satisfied that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust, founded on a sound methodology and the methodology has consistently been applied throughout the study. This particular issue 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
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Pyrford's charm and character, natural lancape, historic buildings and conservation areas are all important and assets for residents of the whole Borough, not just Pyrford. This should be sustained and not compromised and damaged by development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Pyrford's charm and character, natural lancape, historic buildings and conservation areas are all important and assets for residents of the whole Borough, not just Pyrford. This should be sustained and not compromised and damaged by development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	Removal of Green Belt land is a serious matter for all Woking residents and WBC should give sufficient importance to full public consultation and evidence base in its final site allocations.	None stated.	<p>The Council, as set out in planning regulations, has consulted with the public for 6 weeks. All of the representations received have been addressed and modifications to the document will be made where necessary or suitable. The Council however are fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy, that sets out that over the Plan period, around 4,964 dwellings will be delivered along with retail, commercial and industrial floorspace. By not allocating some or all of the sites could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council's evidence base is set out on its website. It is updated on a regular basis and is considered to be robust and up to date. More information on this has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0.</p> <p>Before the Site Allocations DPD is adopted by the Council, it will be subject to a further public consultation period, known as Regulation 19 consultation. It will also be discussed during the Examination in Public. The timescales for this are set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme (L) and is on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	Removal of Green Belt land is a serious matter for all Woking residents and WBC should give sufficient importance to full public consultation and evidence base in its final site allocations.	None stated.	<p>The Council, as set out in planning regulations, has consulted with the public for 6 weeks. All of the representations received have been addressed and modifications to the document will be made where necessary or suitable. The Council however are fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy, that sets out that over the Plan period, around 4,964 dwellings will be delivered along with retail, commercial and industrial floorspace. By not allocating some or all of the sites could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council's evidence base is set out on its website. It is updated on a regular basis and is considered to be robust and up to date. More information on this has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0.</p> <p>Before the Site Allocations DPD is adopted by the Council, it will be subject to a further public consultation period, known as Regulation 19 consultation. It will also be discussed during the Examination in Public. The timescales for this are set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme (L) and is on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	The nature of the village and its surrounding green lancape are the reason why many residents were attracted to live in Pyrford. The draft Neighbourhood Plan, which achieved 98.2% agreement, reflects this and the widespread community concern about the state of local road infrastructure and impact of development at these sites (alongside West Byfleet and Wisley) on congestion.	None stated.	Comment regarding support for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan consultation is noted. The Council's response to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's representation on this consultation can be found under representation 573. The comment on concern about local road infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The nature of the village and its surrounding green lancape are the reason why many residents were attracted to live in Pyrford. The draft Neighbourhood Plan, which achieved 98.2% agreement, reflects this and the widespread community concern about the state of local road infrastructure and impact of development at these sites (alongside West Byfleet and Wisley) on congestion.	None stated.	Comment regarding support for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan consultation is noted. The Council's response to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's representation on this consultation can be found under representation 573. The comment on concern about local road infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB15	The nature of the village and its surrounding green lancape are the reason why many residents were attracted to live in Pyrford. The draft Neighbourhood Plan, which achieved 98.2% agreement, reflects this and the widespread community concern about the state of local road infrastructure and impact of development at these sites (alongside West Byfleet and Wisley) on congestion.	None stated.	Comment regarding support for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan consultation is noted. The Council's response to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's representation on this consultation can be found under representation 573. The comment on concern about local road infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB16	The nature of the village and its surrounding green lancape are the reason why many residents were attracted to live in Pyrford. The draft Neighbourhood Plan, which achieved 98.2% agreement, reflects this and the widespread community concern about the state of local road infrastructure and impact of development at these sites (alongside West Byfleet and Wisley) on congestion.	None stated.	Comment regarding support for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan consultation is noted. The Council's response to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's representation on this consultation can be found under representation 573. The comment on concern about local road infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	No attention is given to changes in demand for local infrastructure resulting from additions in housing stock (schools, medical services and needs of an ageing population). Infrastructure needs are treated as an afterthought. WBC is missing an opportunity to put right existing infrastructure issues and plan what infrastructure is needed, and where it should be located. Large scale new development should not be permitted until an enforceable plan is in place to make infrastructure improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0. 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
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	No attention is given to changes in demand for local infrastructure resulting from additions in housing stock (schools, medical services and needs of an ageing population). Infrastructure needs are treated as an afterthought. WBC is missing an opportunity to put right existing infrastructure issues and plan what infrastructure is needed, and where it should be located. Large scale new development should not be permitted until an enforceable plan is in place to make infrastructure improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0. 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
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	No attention is given to changes in demand for local infrastructure resulting from additions in housing stock (schools, medical services and needs of an ageing population). Infrastructure needs are treated as an afterthought. WBC is missing an opportunity to put right existing infrastructure issues and plan what infrastructure is needed, and where it should be located. Large scale new development should not be permitted until an enforceable plan is in place to make infrastructure improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0. 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
573	Martin	Doyle	General	The title of the public consultation 'Site Allocations DPD' has no reference to the Green Belt and the website only mentions it with regard to evidence base. It is not clear that Green Belt will be affected. Across Surrey there is massive resistance to the release of Green Belt, and therefore it is	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in order to allocate land for a range of uses to deliver the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. The sites identified within the DPD are not exclusive to the Green Belt. As set out in Section A of the DPD, there are over 50 sites identified within the Borough's existing urban areas. Therefore to make reference to the Green Belt in the title of the document could be potentially misleading as it could imply that only Green Belt sites are being put forward for the Boroughs development needs. The Council's	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				worrying that WBC are not clearly asking residents opinions, nor showing a real wish to have an open and fully inclusive public consultation. While the Council may be in a difficult decision with regard to housing, that does not mean they should avoid involving the public.		homepage during the consultation period, as well as the Planning Policy homepage and the Woking2027 website all made reference to the Site Allocations DPD and its position on the Council's website. The Council's engagement with the local community prior to and during the Regulation 18 consultation has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. As set out, the Council has engaged with the community in a number of ways within the available resources and is consistent with both national planning legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.	
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	The title of the public consultation 'Site Allocations DPD' has no reference to the Green Belt and the website only mentions it with regard to evidence base. It is not clear that Green Belt will be affected. Across Surrey there is massive resistance to the release of Green Belt, and therefore it is worrying that WBC are not clearly asking residents opinions, nor showing a real wish to have an open and fully inclusive public consultation. While the Council may be in a difficult decision with regard to housing, that does not mean they should avoid involving the public.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in order to allocate land for a range of uses to deliver the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. The sites identified within the DPD are not exclusive to the Green Belt. As set out in Section A of the DPD, there are over 50 sites identified within the Borough's existing urban areas. Therefore to make reference to the Green Belt in the title of the document could be potentially misleading as it could imply that only Green Belt sites are being put forward for the Boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council's homepage during the consultation period, as well as the Planning Policy homepage and the Woking2027 website all made reference to the Site Allocations DPD and its position on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council's engagement with the local community prior to and during the Regulation 18 consultation has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. As set out, the Council has engaged with the community in a number of ways within the available resources and is consistent with both national planning legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	The title of the public consultation 'Site Allocations DPD' has no reference to the Green Belt and the website only mentions it with regard to evidence base. It is not clear that Green Belt will be affected. Across Surrey there is massive resistance to the release of Green Belt, and therefore it is worrying that WBC are not clearly asking residents opinions, nor showing a real wish to have an open and fully inclusive public consultation. While the Council may be in a difficult decision with regard to housing, that does not mean they should avoid involving the public.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in order to allocate land for a range of uses to deliver the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. The sites identified within the DPD are not exclusive to the Green Belt. As set out in Section A of the DPD, there are over 50 sites identified within the Borough's existing urban areas. Therefore to make reference to the Green Belt in the title of the document could be potentially misleading as it could imply that only Green Belt sites are being put forward for the Boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council's homepage during the consultation period, as well as the Planning Policy homepage and the Woking2027 website all made reference to the Site Allocations DPD and its position on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council's engagement with the local community prior to and during the Regulation 18 consultation has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. As set out, the Council has engaged with the community in a number of ways within the available resources and is consistent with both national planning legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	General	There is no proper demographic analysis or detail about the need for affordable starter homes, or about how to free up large family houses occupied by older residents wanting to downsize to suitable accommodation in the area. Currently the report promotes and aims to permit the wrong type of housing (a large number of executive homes) and fails to meet local need.	None stated.	<p>The purpose of the Draft Site Allocations DPD is to allocate specific sites for the delivery of the Core Strategy (2012) development requirements. It therefore draws on the demographic analysis, and subsequent needs identified, in the Core Strategy. It should be noted that the assessment of housing need has been updated since the Core Strategy, with the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced in 2015. However, the revised SHMA figures are not significantly different from what was assessed during the Core Strategy Examination, and there has been no change to national policy in this respect since then. Therefore there is no need to review the Core Strategy housing requirements (or the demographic analysis on which they are based) at this stage. It is also not the role of this DPD to set housing requirements, or to retrofit the Core Strategy to include specific requirements. It would be inappropriate for the DPD to do this, as this is not its purpose. However, this issues raised are adequately covered by adopted and emerging planning policy, with the Core Strategy (Policy CS13) supporting the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups in suitable locations. The Core Strategy goes on to state that the level of need will be reflected in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council's Housing Mix policy (CS11) and Policy on older people's accommodation (CS13) applies as part of the Development Plan with regard to all site allocations including residential use. Consideration of an appropriate mix of housing to meet the need set out in the development plan (as per the SHMA in the case of older people's accommodation and family housing) will be considered on each site, based on its locational and other characteristics. Further this this, the draft Site Allocations document allocates Site GB16: Broadoaks, Parvis Road, West Byfleet for a mix of uses that includes meeting the accommodation needs of the elderly within the plan period. Site GB4: Land south of High St, Byfleet provides an opportunity for a mix of dwellings, including homes for older people and possible extra care units, as a site safeguarded for development after 2026. In addition, on affordable housing (and starter homes) these are also promoted in the Core Strategy, Policy CS12 Affordable Housing, with requirements set for new housing development, and specific key requirements for affordable homes included within each draft Site Allocations as appropriate.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
573	Martin	Doyle	GB12	There is no proper demographic analysis or detail about the need for affordable starter homes, or about how to free up large family houses occupied by older residents wanting to downsize to suitable accommodation in the area. Currently the report promotes and aims to permit the wrong type of housing (a large number of executive homes) and fails to meet local need.	None stated.	The purpose of the Draft Site Allocations DPD is to allocate specific sites for the delivery of the Core Strategy (2012) development requirements. It therefore draws on the demographic analysis, and subsequent needs identified, in the Core Strategy. It should be noted that the assessment of housing need has been updated since the Core Strategy, with the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced in 2015. However, the revised SHMA figures are not significantly different from what was assessed during the Core Strategy Examination, and there has been no change to national policy in this respect since then. Therefore there is no need to review the Core Strategy housing requirements (or the demographic analysis on which they are based) at this stage. It is also not the role of this DPD to set housing requirements, or to retrofit the Core Strategy to include specific requirements. It would be inappropriate for the DPD to do this, as this is not its purpose. However, the issues raised in the representation are adequately covered by adopted and emerging planning policy, with the Core Strategy (Policy CS13) supporting the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups in suitable locations. The Core Strategy goes on to state that the level of need will be reflected in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council's Housing Mix policy (CS11) and Policy on older people's accommodation (CS13) applies as part of the Development Plan with regard to all site allocations including residential use. Consideration of an appropriate mix of housing to meet the need set out in the development plan (as per the SHMA in the case of older people's accommodation and family housing) will be considered on each site, based on its locational and other characteristics. Further this this, the draft Site Allocations document allocates Site GB16: Broadoaks, Parvis Road, West Byfleet for a mix of uses that includes meeting the accommodation needs of the elderly within the plan period. Site GB4: Land south of High St, Byfleet provides an opportunity for a mix of dwellings, including homes for older people and possible extra care units, as a site safeguarded for development after 2026. In addition, affordable housing (and starter homes) is promoted in the Core Strategy, Policy CS12 Affordable Housing, with requirements set for new housing development. The draft allocation includes the specific key requirements for a contribution towards Affordable Housing provision, in this case 50% to be provided on site. It is considered that such a specific requirement helps to address the need for affordable housing in Pyrford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
573	Martin	Doyle	GB13	There is no proper demographic analysis or detail about the need for affordable starter homes, or about how to free up large family houses occupied by older residents wanting to downsize to suitable accommodation in the area. Currently the report promotes and aims to permit the wrong type of housing (a large number of executive homes) and fails to meet local need.	None stated.	The purpose of the Draft Site Allocations DPD is to allocate specific sites for the delivery of the Core Strategy (2012) development requirements. It therefore draws on the demographic analysis, and subsequent needs identified, in the Core Strategy. It should be noted that the assessment of housing need has been updated since the Core Strategy, with the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced in 2015. However, the revised SHMA figures are not significantly different from what was assessed during the Core Strategy Examination, and there has been no change to national policy in this respect since then. Therefore there is no need to review the Core Strategy housing requirements (or the demographic analysis on which they are based) at this stage. It is also not the role of this DPD to set housing requirements, or to retrofit the Core Strategy to include specific requirements. It would be inappropriate for the DPD to do this, as this is not its purpose. However, the issues raised in the representation are adequately covered by adopted and emerging planning policy, with the Core Strategy (Policy CS13) supporting the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups in suitable locations. The Core Strategy goes on to state that the level of need will be reflected in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council's Housing Mix policy (CS11) and Policy on older people's accommodation (CS13) applies as part of the Development Plan with regard to all site allocations including residential use. Consideration of an appropriate mix of housing to meet the need set out in the development plan (as per the SHMA in the case of older people's accommodation and family housing) will be considered on each site, based on its locational and other characteristics. Further this this, the draft Site Allocations document allocates Site GB16: Broadoaks, Parvis Road, West Byfleet for a mix of uses that includes meeting the accommodation needs of the elderly within the plan period. Site GB4: Land south of High St, Byfleet provides an opportunity for a mix of dwellings, including homes for older people and possible extra care units, as a site safeguarded for development after 2026. In addition, affordable housing (and starter homes) is promoted in the Core Strategy, Policy CS12 Affordable Housing, with requirements set for new housing development. The draft allocation includes the specific key requirements for a contribution towards Affordable Housing provision, in this case 50% to be provided on site. It is considered that such a specific requirement helps to address the need for affordable housing in Pyrford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1033	Micheal	Doyle	General	Objects. Lack of proper consultation with the Public.	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
1033	Micheal	Doyle	General	Lack of forward planning to provide necessary infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1033	Micheal	Doyle	General	Brownfield sites have not been fully investigated as an alternative to Green Belt land.	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
1033	Micheal	Doyle	General	Will fundamentally change all aspects of villages.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0  In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1214	Angela	Doyle	General	The fails to address properly the effects of new developments on infrastructure. Roads in Pyrford are narrow and suffer congestion at peak times. Additional development will increase danger. Pyrford C of E Primary School is due to be rebuilt at its current capacity. This means the extra children will have to be driven to schools further away. Pressure on utilities such as sewerage will lead to problems. Infrastructure is treated as an afterthought. The Council is missing an opportunity to determine what infrastructure improvements are required and where. An enforceable infrastructure plan is needed before development proceeds.	WBC should re-examine the evidence base in the Site Allocations DPD and revise the recommendations, so that they accord with the suitability assessment ranking within the PBA study. The final report needs to develop a structured and strategic approach to the Infrastructure impacts of releasing Green Belt sites for future housing development. Removal of Green Belt land is a serious matter for all Woking residents and it is imperative that WBC give sufficient importance to full public consultation of the final site allocation recommendations and the related evidence base.	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1214	Angela	Doyle	General	The Site Allocations DPD is seriously flawed. It relies on the Peter Brett Associates (PBA) study. Sites GB12 and GB13 were consistently evaluated as unsuitable by the PBA study but GB12 was recommended, solely on grounds of availability. GB13 was judged unsuitable and was not recommended by PBA but this reappears in the draft DPD. Such decisions are inadequately justified anomalies.	WBC should re-examine the evidence base in the Site Allocations DPD and revise the recommendations, so that they accord with the suitability assessment ranking within the PBA study. The final report needs to develop a structured and strategic approach to the Infrastructure impacts of releasing Green Belt sites for future housing development. Removal of Green Belt land is a serious matter for all Woking residents and it is imperative that WBC give sufficient importance to full public consultation of the final site allocation recommendations and the related evidence base.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by a multiple number of evidence base studies. The list of evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocation DPD is included at Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD. The Green Belt boundary review report is an important one of them. The Council is satisfied that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust and is underpinned by a robust methodology. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites by assessing their environmental, social and economic implications. The combined information gathered from the evidence supports the allocation of sites GB12 and GB13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1214	Angela	Doyle	General	The DPD displays a lack of broad strategic thinking. Each Green Belt site is considered in isolation. There has been no systematic review of the overall shape and functioning of the Green Belt that Woking needs to retain.	WBC should re-examine the evidence base in the Site Allocations DPD and revise the recommendations, so that they accord with the suitability	The Core Strategy sets out the overall spatial strategy for Woking. The proposed allocation of sites is in general conformity with the spatial strategy. The SA and the Green Belt boundary review applies a consistent methodology in reviewing the suitability of the sites. The Council therefore would not agree that a systematic review had not been undertaken.	No further modification is 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 ranking within the PBA study. The final report needs to develop a structured and strategic approach to the Infrastructure impacts of releasing Green Belt sites for future housing development. Removal of Green Belt land is a serious matter for all Woking residents and it is imperative that WBC give sufficient importance to full public consultation of the final site allocation recommendations and the related evidence base.		
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	As a local teacher, has great concerns about the effect on local education. Local schools, which are already squeezed, cannot cope with such huge increases in numbers. Local schools have a great reputation, a huge advantage for local residents, and extra strain could damage the high standards currently delivered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	As a local teacher, has great concerns about the effect on local education. Local schools, which are already squeezed, cannot cope with such huge increases in numbers. Local schools have a great reputation, a huge advantage for local residents, and extra strain could damage the high standards currently delivered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	The charm and character of Pyrford is important and historical, and a great part of the Borough. Views are amazing and there is great access via footpaths to the countryside. Any further removal of the Green Belt would be detrimental to the area, and local heritage sites and conservation should be maintained and left unspoilt. The enjoyment of unspoilt countryside is a huge asset to the country.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, the lancape 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	No further modification is 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 or new green infrastructure.	
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	The charm and character of Pyrford is important and historical, and a great part of the Borough. Views are amazing and there is great access via footpaths to the countryside. Any further removal of the Green Belt would be detrimental to the area, and local heritage sites and conservation should be maintained and left unspoilt. The enjoyment of unspoilt countryside is a huge asset to the country.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, the lancape 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
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	Concerned about the proposed development. Recently bought our forever family home in Pyrford to ensure our children have the same village upbringing as myself, and to be part of village life, which is so important to the residents of Pyrford. This will be changed forever.	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
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	Concerned about the proposed development. Recently bought our forever family home in Pyrford to ensure our children have the same village upbringing as myself, and to be part of village life, which is so important to the residents of Pyrford. This will be changed forever.	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
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	This is a community we and others have chosen to live in, and spent a great deal of money to do so, because of the pleasant environment and safety. Such huge changes could damage that and the pleasure of living in a quaint historic village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	This is a community we and others have chosen to live in, and spent a great deal of money to do so, because of the pleasant environment and safety. Such huge changes could damage that and the pleasure of living in a quaint historic village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	Please listen to our concerns and consider other areas, that have the correct infrastructure to deal with such large expansion. The uniqueness of the village should be recognised and preserved, and not caused irreparable damage.	None stated.	All representations made in response to this consultation will be dually considered in line with national guidance and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 3.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	Please listen to our concerns and consider other areas, that have the correct infrastructure to deal with such large expansion. The uniqueness of the village should be recognised and preserved, and not caused irreparable damage.	None stated.	All representations made in response to this consultation will be dually considered in line with national guidance and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 3.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB12	The village is already congested, specifically the area near the shops, where it is difficult to park. This is worsened whenever there is a village or church event. The main road is already dangerous due to parking. Furthermore there is also bad traffic trying to leave Pyrford on the Old Woking Road, for traffic accessing the A3 and for those driving towards Ripley on single file country lanes and across Newark Bridge. Any increase to house numbers would worsen these issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet need in local areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1412	Katie	Drabble	GB13	The village is already congested, specifically the area near the shops, where it is difficult to park. This is worsened whenever there is a village or church event. The main road is already dangerous due to parking. Furthermore there is also bad traffic trying to leave Pyrford on the Old Woking Road, for traffic accessing the A3 and for those driving towards	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. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet need in local 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
				Ripley on single file country lanes and across Newark Bridge. Any increase to house numbers would worsen these issues.			
713	M	Drake	GB12	Development in the protected Green Belt will increase traffic. Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network, including residential roads. 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
713	M	Drake	GB13	Development in the protected Green Belt will increase traffic. Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network, including residential roads. 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
713	M	Drake	GB12	Accept that there is pressure for housing building but this should be in the towns of Woking and Guildford rather than village Green Belts where the road network and infrastructure is not able to support development. There will be a devastating impact.	None stated.	The housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. The Site Allocations DPD includes over 50 sites in the existing urban area, where there is good access to existing services and community facilities. Nevertheless many of these sites, in particular the ones in Woking Town Centre, are proposed to be flatted developments. The housing need in the Borough is for both flats and houses. Therefore it is important that the Site Allocations DPD also identifies sufficient land for housing developments.  The Core Strategy aims to facilitate the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the plan period. 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.	No further modification is 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 infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The representation regarding the impact of development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	
713	M	Drake	GB13	Accept that there is pressure for housing building but this should be in the towns of Woking and Guildford rather than village Green Belts where the road network and infrastructure is not able to support development. There will be a devastating impact.	None stated.	The housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. The Site Allocations DPD includes over 50 sites in the existing urban area, where there is good access to existing services and community facilities. Nevertheless many of these sites, in particular the ones in Woking Town Centre, are proposed to be flatted developments. The housing need in the Borough is for both flats and houses. Therefore it is important that the Site Allocations DPD also identifies sufficient land for housing developments. The Core Strategy aims to facilitate the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the plan period. 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. The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The representation regarding the impact of development on local 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
713	M	Drake	GB12	The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account. There has been an increase in traffic due to previous developments in the village, which is a legitimate use of land.	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 congestion and the impact 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
713	M	Drake	GB13	The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account. There has been an increase in traffic due to previous developments in the village, which is a legitimate use of land.	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 congestion and the impact 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.</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
713	M	Drake	GB12	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse as well as other facilities in the surrounding areas.	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 representation regarding the impact on the character of Pyrford 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
713	M	Drake	GB13	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse as well as other facilities in the surrounding areas.	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 representation regarding the impact on the character of Pyrford 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
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Archaeology (suggested field nearest to Hillside has possible value)	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Flooding	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Increased Crime	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Increased Noise	None stated.	<p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1635	J	Draper	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
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Loss of Arable and Amenity land	None stated.	As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Loss of Green Fiel and Escarpment Feature	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 green fiel.  As noted within the Green Belt boundary review and the key requirements in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the escarpment around Mayford will be an important lancape consideration in the preparation of any development scheme. This will make sure that the integrity of the escarpment is not undermined.  Further information regarding the impact on lancape is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	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 and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						avoidance 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.	
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Pollution	None stated.	New recreation space will incorporate floodlighting which will increase light pollution. However as noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.  The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Suggests exploring other possible Brownfield sites as per Government Directives. Aware that representations received will be made public.	Explore other possible brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.  The representations received from the Regulation 18 consultation will be made publically accessible both online and at Civic Offices.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Wildlife protection	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1635	J	Draper	GB8	Woking and Mayford should not be merged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1328	David, Jill	Drinkwater	GB8	Development will generate noise, air pollution and traffic. The A320 is already very busy	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
1328	David, Jill	Drinkwater	GB8	Object to the development within the GB, which can not be reversed	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1328	David, Jill	Drinkwater	GB8	Consider unused brownfield sites and redevelopment under modern, design, energy efficient construction standards.	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 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB4	Consider the impact on existing residents. There are other areas more suitable for redevelopment and investment.	Consider alternative options	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraphs 1.5-1.6. Please also see Sections 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB5	Consider the impact on existing residents. There are other areas more suitable for redevelopment and investment.	Consider alternative options	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraphs 1.5-1.6. Please also see Sections 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB4	Development will destroy the character of the village and place a strain on the already strained infrastructure.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB5	Development will destroy the character of the village and place a strain on the already strained infrastructure.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB4	The GB is the reason why residents have chosen to live in this area. The proposals will exacerbate traffic problems which will have a knock on effect on house value and crime. The appeal of the area to live will be lost.	None stated.	This representation regarding the loss of GB has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9. Please also see Section 7.0 and 23.0.  The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB5	The GB is the reason why residents have chosen to live in this area. The proposals will exacerbate traffic problems which will have a knock on effect on house value and crime. The appeal of the area to live will be lost.	None stated.	This representation regarding the loss of GB has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9. Please also see Section 7.0 and 23.0. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The various 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB4	The proposal is unsuitable. The land floods and the area can not support the amount of traffic. Consider alternative options	Consider alternative options	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1284	Tara	Drummond-Finnis	GB5	The proposal is unsuitable. The land floods and the area can not support the amount of traffic. Consider alternative options	Consider alternative options	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, in particular paragraph 5.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB12	Local infrastructure can not support this amount of development. Pyrford Common Road is a dangerous road (frequent accidents on the bend and tailbacks from Old Woking Road), Warren Lane can be hazardous (poor visibility) and queues no Newark Lane into Ripley. Housing development would significantly increase traffic volumes, noise, congestion and accident risk.	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
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB13	Local infrastructure can not support this amount of development. Pyrford Common Road is a dangerous road (frequent accidents on the bend and tailbacks from Old Woking Road), Warren Lane can be hazardous (poor visibility) and queues no Newark Lane into Ripley. Housing development would significantly increase traffic volumes, noise, congestion and accident risk.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB12	Assume most of the homes planned would be aimed at families with young children. This would significantly increase pressure on primary school and nursery places. Even expanded, the school could not accommodate the extra children. Not being able to send one's child to their local village school is a real disincentive for young parents to remain in the village.	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
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB13	Assume most of the homes planned would be aimed at families with young children. This would significantly increase pressure on primary school and nursery places. Even expanded, the school could not accommodate the extra children. Not being able to send one's child to their local village school is a real disincentive for young parents to remain in the village.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB12	There will be intolerable pressure on local medical resources. Existing practices already stretched.	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
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB13	There will be intolerable pressure on local medical resources. Existing practices already stretched.	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
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB12	We are against this redevelopment for the following reasons:  Pyrford is rare in Woking in benefitting from a rural environment with far-reaching views, pleasant walks and easy access to the Wey Navigation. Development would fundamentally change the nature of the area. Combined with proposed development by Guildford Borough Council at Wisley, Ripley and Send, the identity of the villages would be entirely lost and result in more 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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in 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 will work with Guildford Borough Council to ensure that any development at Wisley does not put undue pressure on infrastructure and traffic in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB13	We are against this redevelopment for the following reasons:  Pyrford is rare in Woking in benefitting from a rural environment with far-reaching views, pleasant walks and easy access to the Wey Navigation. Development would fundamentally change the nature of the area. Combined with proposed development by Guildford Borough Council at Wisley, Ripley and Send, the identity of the villages would be entirely lost and result in more 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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council accepts that Pyrford has its distinctive character. However, it believes that this will not be compromised by the proposals. Under the duty to cooperate, the Council will make sure that it works with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to ensure that development in their area do not have undue adverse impacts in Woking.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB12	The Council has to date failed to respond to representations from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum or their advisers. We hope you will consider the views of individual worried residents.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the 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 for development is addressed 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
1110	Melanie	Duke	GB13	The Council has to date failed to respond to representations from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum or their advisers. We	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the 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 for development is addressed 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
				hope you will consider the views of individual worried residents.		Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	of this representation
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	Explains that the bus services available from Sheerwater. The bus service is not as frequent and convenient as it has been suggested. Resident will not be encouraged to use public transport unless drastic action is taken to provide a comprehensive bus service.	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
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	It is suggested that Members of the Council visit the estate and witness the parking problems for themselves and then consider whether the addition of 500 new dwellings really is the way forward.	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
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	Particular parking problems along Dartmouth Avenue. The problems will be exacerbated with the regeneration proposal	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
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	Considers it irresponsible to build on designated flood plain regardless of latest technology. There have been incidents when the schools foundation have sunk. Mitigation measures mean to lessen the severity of, it does not mean the measures would cure the problem.	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
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	Sheerwater is continually described as 'one of the most deprived areas of Surrey'. Considers it was the Council's earlier policies that created this problem and now the Council is using it as an excuse to knock down hundreds of perfectly sound homes. Instead, the Council should be looking at how it could bring properties with actual deficiencies, up-to-scratch, with demolition being a, limited, last resort.	None stated.	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The policy seeks to achieve sustainable communities for Woking and improve upon the wellbeing of its people. To achieve this the Council acknowledged the more vulnerable areas in the borough and sought to work with its partners to ensure resources were targeted in order to bring about positive change in these areas.  National statistics known as 'Indices of Multiple deprivation', provides a overall picture of potential disadvantaged communities. The Council notes that these statistics are a measure of relative deprivation and not necessarily a measure of affluence, it is accepted that not every person in a highly deprived area will themselves be deprived. Likewise, there will be some deprived people living in the least deprived areas. Although the Council accepts that the index is not an absolute measure of deprivation, it does provide an overall, quantifiable picture of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	The most important aspect of the Sheerwater Regeneration is the lack of parking. The assumption that residents will give up their cars is flawed. The lack of proper parking spaces will result in people parking recklessly on verges, affecting sight lines and therefore having adverse affects on road safety	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
1345	Sue	Dunbar	UA32	If residents rely on the bus service they would be limited to what they can do to certain times of the day when the service is available. Residents need a vehicle so they access other services/facilities/activities at their convenience.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges the convenience of owning a car and the benefits it may bring. However, one of the key principles of sustainability is to ensure development proposals contribute to the protection and enhancement of the environment. There are a range of measures to achieve this, this includes encouraging sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling and public transport. This can be achieved through locating development in sustainable locations close to local services and facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
408	Paul	Duncan	General	Shelter is a basic human right. The availability of housing in the SE is severely limited which makes what is available very expensive. WBC can not solve the problem alone but it can contribute to alleviating it. Woking can build 5000 of the 3 million new homes for Britain. The Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document is excellent. Key benefits are the increased supply in affordable and general residential housing which is desperately needed. The Draft Site Allocation DPD should be implemented in full.	None stated.	The support for the Site Allocation is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB12	2. The Council has substantially departed from its own independent advisers' recommendations for Pyrford.	None stated.	The has used a range of evidence base including the Green Belt boundary review to inform the DPD. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocation of the sites. The issue about how the Council has used information in the Green Belt boundary review 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1146		Dunham	GB13	The Council has substantially departed from its own independent advisers' recommendations for Pyrford.	None stated.	The particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB12	3. Unacceptable that the Council chose to defer action on PNF's points whilst a question mark surrounds Pyrford issues.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the 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 for development is addressed 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
1146		Dunham	GB13	Unacceptable that the Council chose to defer action on PNF's points whilst a question mark surrounds Pyrford issues.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the 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 for development is addressed 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
1146		Dunham	GB12	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural lancape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough. It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB13	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural lancape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	General	Pyrford is unique with well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt status from our two threatened fiel could cause irreparable damage to heritage assets.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to its historic assets. This is confirmed by representations received from Heritage England. The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB13	It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB12	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock.	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
1146		Dunham	GB13	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1146		Dunham	GB12	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Water pressure already poor in some parts of Pyrford. More school and elderly care places needed. Nursery and pre school already at capacity.	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
1146		Dunham	GB13	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Wish Pyrford to retain its village feel and not be subsumed into Woking. Must consider development impacts. No consideration given to support services i.e. hospitals, schools, doctors, dentists, etc.	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
1146		Dunham	GB13	We object on the following grounds: The Borough has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concern about the Green Belt Review, the Executive proceeded to publish the DPD.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its clear need to meet the development needs if the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1146		Dunham	GB12	We object on the following grounds: 1. The Borough has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concern about the Green Belt Review, the Executive proceeded to publish the DPD.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Traffic studies in 2002 and 2015 show the A245 as congested. The road is in critical condition and the Council are turning a blind eye to the problem. The RTPI estimate large developments increase traffic movements by 10-15%pa.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Traffic studies in 2002 and 2015 show the A245 as congested. The road is in critical condition and the Council are turning a blind eye to the problem. The RTPI estimate large developments increase traffic movements by 10-15%pa.	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
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	Local medical facilities are almost at capacity now 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
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	Local medical facilities are almost at capacity now 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
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	Local school are already at capacity and are having to be extended, further development will make the situation worse. Additional children from new developments have not been factored into SCC demand projections. The area does not have or is planned to have a secondary school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	Local school are already at capacity and are having to be extended, further development will make the situation worse. Additional children from new developments have not been factored into SCC demand projections. The area does not	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 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
				have or is planned to have a secondary school.			
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	The condition and capacity of utilities including gas, electricity, water, wastes water and sewage have not been scrutinised in relation to additional residents from two large developments. The Council have asked the providers who report there is no problem.	None stated.	With respect to utilities, this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.9 and 3.10 in particular. The Council will also continue to consult with utility providers in preparing the Development Plan Document.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	The condition and capacity of utilities including gas, electricity, water, wastes water and sewage have not been scrutinised in relation to additional residents from two large developments. The Council have asked the providers who report there is no problem.	None stated.	With respect to utilities, this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.9 and 3.10 in particular. The Council will also continue to consult with utility providers in preparing the Development Plan Document.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	The proposal is opportunist because the land is there and the Council have to find land for development irrespective that it is Green Belt. The Council has not the criteria for the release of Green Belt in relation to the siting of development, access and provision of health and community care services and school places and utility provision.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is based on robust evidence that includes the Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Lancape Character Assessment. The full list of documents are all set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.  The criteria set out in representation have been considered and attention is drawn specifically to the Sustainability Appraisal. Nevertheless, as noted in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0), the Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that development is supported by adequate infrastructure provision and that there is no adverse impact on the existing provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	The proposal is opportunist because the land is there and the Council have to find land for development irrespective that it is Green Belt. The Council has not the criteria for the release of Green Belt in relation to the siting of development, access and provision of health and community care services and school places and utility provision.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is based on robust evidence that includes the Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Lancape Character Assessment. The full list of documents are all set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.  The criteria set out in representation have been considered and attention is drawn specifically to the Sustainability Appraisal. Nevertheless, as noted in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0), the Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that development is supported by adequate infrastructure provision and that there is no adverse impact on the existing provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	Through a WBNF public consultation over 95% of residents do not want to lose Green Belt, however they accept GB15 needs a firm and viable proposal "employment led, mixed economy".	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	Through a WBNF public consultation over 95% of residents do not want to lose Green Belt, however they accept GB15 needs a firm and viable proposal "employment led, mixed economy".	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB15	GB15 and GB16 are the only substantial areas of Green Belt in West Byfleet. Once removed it has gone and will take the rest of land over time. 45ha equals 38% of Green Belt being removed.	None stated.	It is correct that the Council has identified sufficient land in the existing urban areas for development until 2022. This is further set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  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.  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
1001	Neil	Dunn	GB16	GB15 and GB16 are the only substantial areas of Green Belt in West Byfleet. Once removed it has gone and will take the rest of land over time. 45ha equals 38% of Green Belt being removed.	None stated.	It is correct that the Council has identified sufficient land in the existing urban areas for development until 2022. This is further set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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	No further modification is 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. 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. 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>	
923	Timothy	Dunne	UA23	Wildlife will be affected by potential flooding from the canal and pollution from increased traffic.	<p>Leave Sheerwater Park alone, remove the red line zone, and just renovate the flats instead.</p>	<p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <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 Council's 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. This will be a consideration</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						in any proposed scheme that comes forward as part of the Development Management process.	
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB10	Objects to the proposals. Hook Hill Lane is a very narrow road and access to a new housing site from it would cause traffic problems. It is already as hazard and used as a cut through.	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
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB11	Objects to the proposals. Hook Hill Lane is a very narrow road and access to a new housing site from it would cause traffic problems. It is already as hazard and used as a cut through.	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
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB14	Objects to the proposals. Hook Hill Lane is a very narrow road and access to a new housing site from it would cause traffic problems. It is already as hazard and used as a cut through.	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
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB10	The removal of these Green Belt areas would be detrimental to the surrounding fiel and woodland, and would spoil the unique atmosphere of this part of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraph 7.3-7.4 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB11	The removal of these Green Belt areas would be detrimental to the surrounding fiel and woodland, and would spoil the unique atmosphere of this part of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraph 7.3-7.4 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1516	C.J. , L	Dunncliffe	GB14	The removal of these Green Belt areas would be detrimental to the surrounding fiel and woodland, and would spoil the unique atmosphere of this part of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraph 7.3-7.4 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB13	Concerned the Council has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and their Green Belt Review advisers. This is perverse: what is the point of obtaining independent advice if it is not going to be used to inform policy planning? Pyrford issues need to be resolved before the development plan is agreed.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its clear need to meet the development needs if the area. The approach taken to use the Green Belt boundary review to inform the DPD is set out 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
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB12	Concerned the Council has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and their Green Belt Review advisers. This is perverse: what is the point of obtaining independent advice if it is not going to be used to inform policy planning? Pyrford issues need to be resolved before the development plan is agreed.	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. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB12	I am concerned about this proposed development, in addition to others in West Byfleet and Wisley Airfield. I completely accept the need for additional housing in the borough and that the Council must produce a viable long-term housing plan to prevent one being imposed by government. However the proposals are ill considered and do not take into account the state of infrastructure (significant pressures on local roads, rising air pollution).	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
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB13	I am concerned about this proposed development, in addition to others in West Byfleet and Wisley Airfield. I completely accept the need for additional housing in the borough and that the Council must produce a viable long-term housing plan to prevent one being imposed by government. However the proposals are ill considered and do not take into account the state of infrastructure (significant pressures on local	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				roads, rising air pollution).		increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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.	
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB12	There would be significant pressures on other essential services.	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
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB13	There would be significant pressures on other essential services.	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
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB12	Striking that the proposals would impact mainly upon the east of the Borough. Why has development in the west been largely ignored?	None stated.	Because of the constraints across the Borough, the Council has to identify land in sustainable locations to meet the development needs of the area. Based on the evidence, the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB13	Striking that the proposals would impact mainly upon the east of the Borough. Why has development in the west been largely ignored?	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives considered. The Council has been concerned 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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB12	Pyrford is unique, it has a number of well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Heritage assets must be preserved for future generations. The current plan would irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1132	Fiona	Dunstan	GB13	Pyrford is unique, it has a number of well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Heritage assets must be preserved for future generations. The current plan would irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1134	Chris	Dunstan	GB13	Development on the top of a hill at Upshot Lane will be a significant eyesore, visible for miles. Woking Borough Council has disregarded its advisers recommendations about Pyrford. I understand the need for new housing, however the current proposals do not take account of the strain on infrastructure, the impact	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				on village character and surrounding Green Belt.		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.	
1134	Chris	Dunstan	GB12	Development on the top of a hill at Upshot Lane will be a significant eyesore, visible for miles. Woking Borough Council has disregarded its advisers recommendations about Pyrford. I understand the need for new housing, however the current proposals do not take account of the strain on infrastructure, the impact on village character and surrounding Green Belt.	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
1134	Chris	Dunstan	GB13	I have concerns about the proposed housing developments in Pyrford and West Byfleet. These will overwhelm the road infrastructure. Pyrford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, bringing pollution.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The issues are also comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1, 7, 19 and 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1134	Chris	Dunstan	GB12	I have concerns about the proposed housing developments in Pyrford and West Byfleet. These will overwhelm the road infrastructure. Pyrford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, bringing pollution.	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
1685	M	Durman	General	Do not consider Mayford to be a suitable location for development and urge the Council to consider other areas of the borough.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the proposals. Based on the Sustainability Appraisal the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other alternatives considered. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs. There is not sufficient land in the urban area 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
						meet the needs of the entire plan period. Green Belt land will be needed to meet future developments needs between 2022 and 2027 in accordance with the Core Strategy. The specific justification for safeguarding land beyond 2027 is set out in detail in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1685	M	Durman	GB7	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB8	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB9	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB10	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1685	M	Durman	GB11	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB14	Protest at the proposals. Mayford will be overcrowded and no longer regarded as a pleasant village to live.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB7	Object to the proposal. Why are Travellers singled out for special treatment, the area already has sufficient Traveller sites.	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
1685	M	Durman	GB7	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This	No further modification is 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 also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	
1685	M	Durman	GB8	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB9	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB10	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB11	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment	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
						(TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	of this representation
1685	M	Durman	GB14	Saunders Lane is too narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	The insufficient time given to respond has meant the comments were rushed and not fully explained on some issues. The comments should have been more widely advertised, it is not sufficient to just upload the documents online. More effort should be made to publicise and raise awareness of the consultation.	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
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Objective 7,9 &11 Comments in regards to minimising air, light and noise pollution, do not appear to be backed up by legitimate evidence. Public transport networks have already been improved. The proposals are likely to increase relocation athletics track.	Smaller scale regeneration of accommodation and facilities that are in need	With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.  The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements including mitigation measures in relation to potential noise, light and air quality; the incorporation of sustainable construction techniques; improved permeability of the site to encourage pedestrian and cycle accessibility. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless the proposed allocation 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
						<p>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</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>	
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	<p>Objective 9 &amp;10. Clearly, a development of this size will have a hugely negative impact on the natural biodiversity of the area. Including impact to the Basingstoke SSSI. Disagrees that the statement that careful design would be required to ensure there is no adverse impact on local biodiversity'- does not consider this can be achieved given there will be a loss of green space and therefore increased fragmentation. Evidence of the potential impact to biodiversity should have already been gathered.</p>	<p>Detailed surveys completed and advice sought to aid in protecting the biodiversity of Sheerwater. A small scale regeneration that minimises the impact on the local environment and pollution levels.</p>	<p>The SA acknowledges the proximity of the site to the SSSI and the potential impact it would have and has scored the site accordingly. However, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless the proposed allocation 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. The Key Requirements also require mitigation measures for noise and light pollution particularly along the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and SSSI. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	<p>Objective 14. There is an increased risk of water contamination given the location of the site adjacent to the Basingstoke Canal (SSSI). This will have a knock on impact on habitats and species along here. There must be more suitable sites that would pose less of a risk.</p>	<p>Better evaluation of alternatives to current proposals including evaluating more suitable sites within the borough that do not pose such risks to our established waterways, or that a smaller scale regeneration would be more suitable in order to protect and minimise the risks to the watercourse, of contamination.</p>	<p>The SA acknowledges the proximity of the site to the SSSI and the potential impact it would have and has scored the site accordingly. However, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless the proposed allocation will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. The Key Requirements also require mitigation measures for noise and light pollution particularly along the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and SSSI. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	<p>Objective 3. If the objective is to protect development from flooding then why is the Council choosing to build on these flood risk areas. Surely this is putting the public's well being at risk? This should surely score an negative rating here?</p>	<p>Properly evaluate alternative sites for development, or a</p>	<p>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'.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					smaller scale regeneration that does not require development on at risk flood plains.		
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Objective 4. If the objective is to reduce poverty, crime and social exclusion then it appears that the Council is not seeking to address the root cause of the problem but to instead rehouse existing residents. This would change the demographic of Sheerwater and give the impression that the issues have been tackled. The proposals do not appear to make actual efforts to improve the inequalities.	If smaller regeneration took place, i.e. some of the badly in need flats on Dartmouth avenue, then a sense of a 'making better our community', could be established, benefits that would actually benefit the existing residents. It might be possible to encourage local 'out of work' residents to get involved and contribute to their community, in this way, the benefit of increasing employment opportunities still exists, and may in fact lead to new skills being learnt, and increased confidence to continue to seek employment. This may also bring about a better sense of control, ownership and pride within their community, and develop better	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The site has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which has assessed the site against 17 SA objectives. Based on the outcome of this exercise and the other supporting evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the 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
					relationships. This all could have a very real and felt positive impact on those described as most at need. I would suggest this would go much further in actually positively impact the issues of poverty, crime and social exclusion.		
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Objective 2. The mass demolition of Sheerwater is not going to support objectives for improved health and wellbeing of existing residents. Most of the existing residents will not benefit from the plans. It would appear that the existing proposals serve to benefit one section of the wider, community. The wealthier. Existing residents have good access to various facilities and open space. Therefore the plans are in effect depriving existing residence from these benefits by seeking to rehouse them. WBC, describes the area as being disadvantaged and suffering most from health inequalities however the proposals are seeking to address the problem by relocating existing residents.	Improvements can and should be made to existing facilities and services, but not at the expense of those who already live here and whom most likely won't actually benefit themselves from the improvements. The Regeneration would better serve the community of Sheerwater if it was on a smaller scale, i.e. tackling the badly in need accommodation along Dartmouth Avenue, and making improvements to facilities and services, to the benefit of existing Sheerwater residents.	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The area has been identified to provide a net addition of 250 houses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Objective 5 Reiterate comments regarding Objective 2. There is already	By all means make	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant	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
				good access to various services and facilities and transport links. The community identified as experiencing high levels of deprivation stand to be rehomed out of the area.	improvements to facilities and services, but not at the expense of those who already live here and whom most likely won't actually benefit themselves from the improvements.	regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The area has been identified to provide a net addition of 250 houses.	of this representation
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Objective 1. Considers there to be a lack of communication and consultation on proposals for Sheerwater Regeneration. It was not made clear that for plans included the breaking up of the community and the rehousing of existing residents. This has caused alarm and uncertainty amongst residents who are affected. Many of which will not be able to remain living in the area. The consultation on plans for Sheerwater is also misguided in that it is consulting with the existing residents of Sheerwater, where most of them will not see any benefits.	There should be better more open communication with local residents, so that they are more fully informed about what the future may or may not hold for them. It is only in enabling Sheerwater residents to become better informed of the actual objectives of the WBC, that there can be a fuller, more knowledgeable participation from the local residents.	With regards to consultation on Planning issues, the Council will consult with the community in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0).  With regards to detailed matters relating to the planning application, we will notify the relevant Section of the Council the concerns raised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	The documents were not sufficiently publicised/accessible. The late awareness means there is insufficient time to properly read through and digest the issues	A more open and transparent form of circulating the information within these documents, in good time of the deadline for submitting comments. I.e. emails alerting residents to the publication of	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The Council will publish the 'Publication' version of the DPD for a regulation 19 consultation to give the public a further opportunity to comment on the document.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					such documents, and/or paper copies supplied to those without the internet.		
1237	Natascha	Durrant	UA32	Concerned that the consultation process for Sheerwater regeneration has been inadequate and ineffective. Evidence of this is the formation of the Independent Sheerwater Scrutiny Panel Review. Similarly, considers there has been inadequate attempts to publicise and consult on the Site Allocation and SA report to the local community. Not everyone has access to the internet and it should not be assumed so.	Better attempts made by the council to supply information to the residents of Sheerwater, that is in a format easily accessible to them i.e. paper copies, which should have been delivered well in advance of the deadline to make comments.	With regards to consultation on Planning issues, the Council will consult with the community in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0).  With regards to detailed matters relating to the planning application, we will notify the relevant Section of the Council the concerns raised.  In January 2015, Woking Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested an investigation into the processes and actions taken by the Council with regard to the Sheerwater Regeneration Project in response to local residents' requests. The final report is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1239	L	Dwyer	General	Building more homes will put a strain on local services. Schools are oversubscribed. Traffic will be exacerbated. It is not fair for current residents of Knaphill (classed as a village) should end up a large busy town.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1239	L	Dwyer	General	Concerned about further building in Knaphill. Concerned and object to plans for development in the GB. The scale of the plans are huge and will ruin the GB.  The loss of GB land will cause flooding.	None stated.	It was decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.  The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Old Woking 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 Old Woking) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1239	L	Dwyer	General	Supports the regeneration of Woking Town Centre and the variety of eateries that have been introduced, however is upset that many trees have been removed from Commercial Way. This is not considered necessary and doesn't feel it should ever be allowed.	None stated.	The comment is noted. Town Centre improvement works is not Planning function, however we will draw the relevant Section of the Council's attention to this representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1239	L	Dwyer	General	Object to development in Knaphill/Brookwood area. Believes the area has already made a significant contribution to housing provision. Traffic in the area has already increased significantly and will be exacerbated and will be intolerable.	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
1239	L	Dwyer	General	The character/views of beautiful countryside is valuable and should not be built on.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				It is understood that if any of the proposed GB land is reserve land then it should never be built on.		<p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	of this representation
1239	L	Dwyer	General	<p>Concerned about the impact on wildlife that would be destroyed if development proposals go ahead. Proposals will impact habitats for birds, BEES, nesting birds, hedgehogs and other nesting animals. Objects to proposals for this reason.</p> <p>There are many commercial development- offices and retail- in the town centre that sit vacant. Does not understand why more is being proposed.</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>With regards to the comment about alternative sites, please see Section 16.0, 9.0 and 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	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.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic 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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the GBBR.			of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should	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
				not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.		The 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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Mayford is 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.	
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				infrastructure and residents living in any major developments 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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 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	No further modification is 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.	
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
781	Sue	Dyer	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. 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. 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 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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
781	Sue	Dyer	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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.	<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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
781	Sue	Dyer	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities on the edge of the urban area. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	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
781	Sue	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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 Lancscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancscape grounds. The Lancscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
782	Mark	Dyer	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						will not change in this particular location.	
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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	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:	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		Green Belt.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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.			
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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	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
				properties.			
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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	No further modification is 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).	
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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</p>	No further modification is 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>	
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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	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

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.		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.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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 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	No further modification is 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.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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. 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. 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 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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.			of this representation
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in 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
				Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.			
782	Mark	Dyer	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal	None stated.	<p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of the escarpment.		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.	
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities on the edge of the urban area. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	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
782	Mark	Dyer	GB14	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
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB17	The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while 98% of the Borough's Green Belt is preserved. There is other land available in the Borough.	None stated.	This site would remain in the Green Belt and is allocated as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace(SANG), to be used as informal public recreation space. However, with regard to sites where removal from the Green Belt is proposed, or sites that are safeguarded to meet future development needs, 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
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB4	The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while 98% of the Borough's Green Belt is preserved. There is other land available in 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 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). Consideration of reasonable alternative sites is 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
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB5	The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while 98% of the Borough's Green Belt is preserved. There is other land available in 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 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). Consideration of reasonable alternative sites is 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
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB17	The current infrastructure (education, health, drains and roads) is inadequate and must be rectified before any development. Additional residents will make already very congested roads unusable.	None stated.	This 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. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB4	The current infrastructure (education, health, drains and roads) is inadequate and must be rectified before any development. Additional residents will make already very congested roads unusable.	None stated.	This 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. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1477	Chris	Dzik	GB5	The current infrastructure (education, health, drains and roads) is inadequate and must be rectified before any development. Additional residents will make already very congested roads unusable.	None stated.	This 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. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation