

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	Inevitable change to village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	Inevitable change to village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	Inevitable increase in traffic, extension and widening of existing roads, and increase in public transport.	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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	Inevitable increase in traffic, extension and widening of existing roads, and increase in public transport.	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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	Inevitable loss of existing ancient hedgerows and paths.	None stated.	It is expected that any ancient hedgerow and paths that is worth protecting will be protected. The Council has robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to protect ancient hedgerows and paths.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	Inevitable loss of existing ancient hedgerows and paths.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to protect ancient hedgerows and paths that are worth protecting.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	Inevitable stress on resources: schools, medical centre, shopping facilities.	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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	Inevitable stress on resources: schools, medical centre, shopping facilities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in 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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	Oppose the plan for 400+ new homes on grounds of loss of Green Belt land.	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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	Oppose the plan for 400+ new homes on grounds of loss of Green Belt land.	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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB12	What is the present decision on development of Wisley Airfield? An area relatively remote from existing housing.	None stated.	The Wisley Airfield has been identified in the Guildford draft Local Plan for a mixed use development to help meet their developments needs. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council will work with Guildford Borough Council to make sure that the development impacts of the proposal 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
1136	Tony	Jackman	GB13	What is the present decision on development of Wisley Airfield? An area relatively remote from existing housing.	None stated.	The Wisley Airfield has been identified in the Guildford draft Local Plan for a mixed use development to help meet their developments needs. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council will work with Guildford Borough Council to make sure that the development impacts of the site are fully assessed and appropriate measures put in place to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1351	Robin	Jackson	GB12	Object to development in Pyrford, which will cause horrendous traffic congestion	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	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>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
1351	Robin	Jackson	GB13	Object to development in Pyrford, which will cause horrendous traffic congestion	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1099	Tony	Jacob	GB12	Little evidence about the impact of plans on infrastructure. Roads are already dangerously congested, especially with the school run. There are more practical options that would be cheaper, less impactful environmentally and would better use existing infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1099	Tony	Jacob	GB13	Little evidence about the impact of plans on infrastructure. Roads are already dangerously congested, especially with the school run. There are more practical options that would be cheaper, less impactful environmentally and would better use existing infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites. Having considered all other known alternative sites, the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives considered by the Council.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1099	Tony	Jacob	GB13	I am concerned that the plans will destroy the Green Belt and local biodiversity corridors, an essential part of our community and why I chose to live here.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1099	Tony	Jacob	GB12	I am concerned that the plans will destroy the Green Belt and local biodiversity corridors, an essential part of our community and why I chose to live here.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. During the preparation of the 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</p>	No further modification is 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 Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1100	Elizabeth	Jacques Jones	GB12	I agree we need more housing BUT infrastructure cannot cope. Parking, schools, doctors etc. already over stretched. Traffic often grid-locked, especially at school drop off/pick up. Development needs much more careful planning. Infrastructure needs sorting before development commences. Traffic and parking would be horrendous.	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
1100	Elizabeth	Jacques Jones	GB13	I agree we need more housing BUT infrastructure cannot cope. Parking, schools, doctors etc. already over stretched. Traffic often grid-locked, especially at school drop off/pick up. Development needs much more careful planning. Infrastructure needs sorting before development commences. Traffic and parking would be horrendous.	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
196	P	Jagger	GB10	National policy allows for release of Green Belt land only in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires 550 homes from Green Belt 2022-2027 but Woking Borough Council has gone further by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes in the period 2027-2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead, the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and this has not been demonstrated for the development post 2027.	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 necessity to safeguard land to meet future development is comprehensively addressed the Issues and Matter Topic Paper Section 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB11	National policy allows for release of Green Belt land only in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires 550 homes from Green Belt 2022-2027 but Woking Borough Council has gone further by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes in the period 2027-2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead, the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and this has not been demonstrated for the development post 2027.	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's justification for safeguarding land to meet development needs between 2027 and 2040 is particularly set out in Section 2 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB10	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is heavily congested at rush hour and will be not unable to cope with the additional traffic.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	
196	P	Jagger	GB11	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is heavily congested at rush hour and will be not unable to cope with the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB10	The proposed housing densities are significantly higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB11	The proposed housing density of 30dph for GB10 and GB11 are excessive to the average density of 5.5dph in Hook Heath and Fisher Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB10	We wish to voice our disapproval of the proposed release of Green Belt land. Hook Heath residents value the open land close by. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages; the proposals would do the opposite.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
196	P	Jagger	GB11	We wish to voice our disapproval of the proposed release of Green Belt land. Hook Heath residents value the open land close by. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages; the proposals would do the opposite.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The 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</p>	No further modification is 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. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined.	
704	Linh	James	GB4	Objects to Green Belt development. Flood risk will increase.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
704	Linh	James	GB5	Objects to Green Belt development. Flood risk will increase.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
704	Linh	James	GB4	Parvis Road will be severely affected	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
704	Linh	James	GB5	Parvis Road will be severely affected	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
704	Linh	James	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
704	Linh	James	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	General	The borough is already over populated and developed. Local infrastructures are over capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB4	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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</p>	No further modification is 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 access 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>	
1048	Stuart	James	GB5	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB4	Byfleet does not have any medical facilities. The schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB5	Byfleet does not have any medical facilities. The schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1048	Stuart	James	GB15	The road network is already at capacity and further development will result in more cars and make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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
1048	Stuart	James	GB16	The road network is already at capacity and further development will result in more cars and make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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
1048	Stuart	James	GB4	Object to development on Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB5	Object to development on Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.	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
1048	Stuart	James	GB4	The proposed development area is a flood plain. Drainage will not cope with the development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB5	The proposed development area is a flood plain. Drainage will not cope with the development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB4	Questions why the short term housing requirement of 500+ dwellings is only being met in the Byfleet and West Byfleet war. The process of meeting future housing requirements should be reviewed and looked at from a County, not Borough level.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB5	Questions why the short term housing requirement of 500+ dwellings is only being met in the Byfleet and West Byfleet war. The process of meeting future housing requirements should be reviewed and looked at from a County, not Borough level.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB15	Questions why the short term housing requirement of 500+ dwellings is only being met in the Byfleet and West Byfleet war. The process of meeting future housing requirements should be reviewed and looked at from a County, not Borough level.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	GB16	Questions why the short term housing requirement of 500+ dwellings is only being met in the Byfleet and West Byfleet war. The process of meeting future housing requirements should be reviewed and looked at from a County, not Borough level.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1048	Stuart	James	General	Questions why the Council are proposing Green Belt development when the Communities Secretary has stated the is no need to develop on Green Belt to meet housing demand.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	General	Allocation of housing need should be driven at a county not borough level, and the whole process needs urgent review and questioning as to how the figures were made.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. In terms of capacity with regard to supporting infrastructure please refer to Section 3.0 of this 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
1450	Keiron	James	General	The borough is already over populated and developed and local infrastructure cannot cope with the proposals. Stop destroying our communities, creating urban spill and destroying our Green Belt.	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
1450	Keiron	James	GB4	The sites do not have appropriate infrastructure. Roads are already very congested and unsuitable to cope with additional traffic. Schools and medical facilities in the areas cannot meet current demand, and will not cope with the additional population from these developments.	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
1450	Keiron	James	GB5	The sites do not have appropriate infrastructure. Roads are already very congested and unsuitable to cope with additional traffic. Schools and medical facilities in the areas cannot meet current demand, and will not cope with the additional population from these developments.	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
1450	Keiron	James	GB4	Byfleet and New Haw railway bridge needs to be made to take two lanes of traffic, which would have a massive impact on traffic flow in Byfleet and West Byfleet.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	GB5	Byfleet and New Haw railway bridge needs to be made to take two lanes of traffic, which would have a massive impact on traffic flow in Byfleet and West Byfleet.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	GB15	Objects to the West Byfleet development, encompassing 742 houses. Asks why WBC's short term delivery target of 500+ houses must be met only in our area.	None stated.	This representation 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 accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough, although it is not true that West Byfleet is the only place that development is proposed (the majority is being delivered in Woking town centre). An even spread of development could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	GB516	Objects to the West Byfleet development, encompassing 742 houses. Asks why WBC's short term delivery target of 500+ houses must be met only in our area.	None stated.	This representation 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 accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough, although it is not true that West Byfleet is the only place that development is proposed (the majority is being delivered in Woking town centre). An even spread of development could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	GB4	Writing to complain about the proposed destruction of Byfleet's Green Belt, which is unacceptable. The land is on Byfleet's flood plain.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1450	Keiron	James	GB5	Writing to complain about the proposed destruction of Byfleet's Green Belt, which is unacceptable. The land is on Byfleet's flood plain.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	General	WBC need to question the Conservative Party about how the figure of 5000 houses are needed in a borough already oversaturated through over development, which doesn't have capacity to deliver without eroding the precious Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. In terms of capacity with regard to supporting infrastructure please refer to Section 3.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1450	Keiron	James	GB4	Asks why WBC's short term delivery target of 500+ houses must be met only in our area.	None stated.	This is not the case, and as the draft Site Allocations DPD shows, housing delivery is distributed around the Borough over the Plan period. The majority is allocated within Woking Town Centre. However, the Council accepts that while there is a distribution of allocated sites, 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
1450	Keiron	James	GB5	Asks why WBC's short term delivery target of 500+ houses must be met only in our area.	None stated.	This is not the case, and as the draft Site Allocations DPD shows, housing delivery is distributed around the Borough over the Plan period. The majority is allocated within Woking Town Centre. However, the Council accepts that while there is a distribution of allocated sites, 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
1240	Sue	Janota	GB14	There is a known Roman Road projected to run through the site. In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB10	Concerns raised regarding a lack of a continuous footway on the north side of Saunders Lane. Hook Hill Lane is largely unsuitable for vehicular access to the development site, it is narrow, unlit, with no footways. Vehicular site access from Smarts Heath Road is very difficult due to the proximity of the Saunders Lane junction and railway bridge.	Issues regarding vehicular and pedestrian accessibility need to be addressed	The comments are helpful and the Council has addressed these in the key requirements through earlier consultation with the County Council. Detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	General	It is important that the cumulative impacts and localised access needs are considered and addressed.	None stated.	This is noted, the Council believes this has been comprehensively addressed	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	General	Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA23	There are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record for UA23	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	General	It would be helpful to mention at the start of the document that the county council is now a statutory consultee on surface water drainage and Su on major development, and that any flood alleviation/defence schemes must support the priorities and objectives of Surrey's Flood Risk Management Strategy. More detailed comments on specific policies in the draft Site Allocations document are set out in the attached annex.	Insert text about the various roles/responsibilities of SCC.	Whilst the Council accepts the importance of the County Council's role as Statutory Consultee regarding surface water drainage and Su. The Council believes that Su and surface water has been adequately covered in the DPD, where the provision of Su is a Key Requirement for each of the sites proposed. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0 which comprehensively address the matter. The Council also has a Su advice note which sets out the requirements in full, the advice note was prepared in conjunction with Surrey County Council.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB10	Access to a local bus service from sites GB10 and GB11 is in excess of the recommended maximum. 'walk to the bus stop' distance. There is a need to examine this issue in more detail with Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group before the allocations are confirmed. Consideration needed in relation to Smarts Heath Road railway bridge. Background traffic growth may use up any spare capacity before the site comes forward. This should be carefully monitored and necessary measures implemented	Examine in detail the bus service with Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group before the allocations are confirmed. Traffic on Smarts Heath Road railway bridge should be closely monitored and if traffic exceeds capacity measures should be implemented.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB11	Access to a local bus service from sites GB10 and GB11 is in excess of the recommended maximum. 'walk to the bus stop' distance. There is a need to examine this issue in more detail with Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group before the allocations are confirmed. Consideration needed in relation to Smarts Heath Road railway bridge. Background traffic growth may use up any spare capacity before the site comes forward. This should be carefully monitored and necessary measures implemented	Examine in detail the bus service with Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group before the allocations are confirmed. Traffic on Smarts Heath Road railway bridge should be closely monitored and if traffic exceeds capacity measures should be implemented.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB12	Both the section of Upshott Lane and all of Pyrford Common Road have no footways and are unlit, giving poor non-car	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	Add a key requirement that the site is within an

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>facilities for south and westbound travel. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access the existing pedestrian facilities on Coldharbour Road. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access local bus services, which are currently limited to 1/hour in each direction.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, both Proposal sites are located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. Both sites are over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.</p>		<p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.</p>	Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment
1240	Sue	Janota	GB13	<p>Both the section of Upshott Lane and all of Pyrford Common Road have no footways and are unlit, giving poor non-car facilities for south and westbound travel. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access the existing pedestrian facilities on Coldharbour Road. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access local bus services, which are currently limited to 1/hour in each direction.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, both Proposal sites are located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. Both sites are over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.</p>	None stated.	<p>The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.</p>	Add a key requirement that the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment
1240	Sue	Janota	GB20	Access to the stated SANG car park only seems feasible from the private road between the High Street and the developed Mill.	None stated.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB21	Access to the stated SANG car park only seems feasible from the private road between the High Street and the developed Mill.	None stated.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA27	No principle transport objections however depending on the scale of development the adequacy of the local road infrastructure may need to be reviewed.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA26	<p>No principle transport objections however depending on the scale of development the adequacy of the local road infrastructure may need to be reviewed.</p> <p>Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20</p>	None stated.	<p>The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.</p>	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	UA29	No principle transport objections however, works may be needed to improve the estate junctions with the A320.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA28	<p>No principle transport objections however, works may be needed to improve the estate junctions with the A320.</p> <p>Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20</p>	None stated.	<p>The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.</p>	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB1	The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. There may be a possible Roman Road running through the site.	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1240	Sue	Janota	GB11	Concerns raised regarding a lack of a continuous footway on the north side of Saunders Lane. Footway, street lighting and pedestrian crossing improvements will be required.	Issues regarding vehicular and pedestrian accessibility need to be addressed and improvements made	The comments are helpful and the Council has addressed these in the key requirements through earlier consultation with the County Council. Detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB14	Hook Hill Lane is narrow, mostly unlit, has no footways / pedestrian facilities, has steep gradients on its northern sections and has a very substandard bridge over the railway line. The site is poorly accessible by public buses. Access requirements will need to be taken into account in determining the specific form of green infrastructure land use of the site.	Access requirements will need to be taken into account in determining the specific form of green infrastructure land use of the site.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB15	Significant A245 site access junction is likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site and further off-site highway improvements may be necessary on the A245. There is a need to address the lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on the south side of the A245 and to provide new/improved pedestrian/cyclist north-south crossing facilities over the A245 to enable access to the existing urban area / local destinations. Bus stops should be located close to the A245 site frontage and the site layout / design should provide as direct as possible a route from the houses to those stops. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy. In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record and the site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. Proposal site GB15 is within a minerals safeguarding area (for sand and gravel) and opportunities for prior extraction should be fully investigated.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites. The Key Requirements notes that the site is within the Surrey Minerals Plan as a safeguarded site and requires opportunities for prior extraction should be fully investigated.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB16	Significant A245 site access junction likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Depending on the scale of employment use, further off-site highway improvements maybe necessary on the A245. There is a need to address the lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on the south side of the A245 and to provide new/improved pedestrian/cyclist north-south crossing facilities over the A245 to enable access to the existing urban area / local destinations and pedestrian / cyclist facilities. Bus stops should be located close to the A245 site frontage and the site layout / design should provide as direct as possible a route from the development to those stops. There is no in-principle transport objection to allocating the site for employment development, subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy. In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record and the site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1240	Sue	Janota	GB17	Highway access to the stated SANG car park only seems feasible from the Old Parvis Road and Murrays Lane, due to the access constraints of the M25 and A245. In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record.	None stated.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB22	There is a Scheduled Monument on site – Woking Palace - and the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential. As it is over 0.4ha, any proposals will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. Historic England will need to be consulted, as will the Friends of Woking Palace, Surrey Archaeological Society and Surrey County Council Heritage Conservation Team. The Surrey County Archaeological Unit also has extensive experience of this site and should be involved in devising any detailed proposals.	None stated.	The Key Requirement notes the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the requirement to submit an archaeological assessment. Reference will be added to consult with relevant stakeholders to bring forward the site.	Insert a new bullet point to read: any proposals will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. Historic England will need to be consulted, as will the Friends of Woking Palace, Surrey Archaeological Society and Surrey County Council Heritage Conservation Team. The Surrey County Archaeological Unit also has extensive experience of this site and should be involved in devising any detailed proposals.
1240	Sue	Janota	GB23	Under the current schools expansion programme there will be building on this site over this year and next year. In the event that future expansion at either school may be necessary, we would wish to see the reasoned justification include the following additional wording: Accordingly, it is allocated for continued use as open space. However, if there is a local need for additional school places locally, we will take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meet requirements. As per Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the need to create, expand/or alter schools will be given great weight in decision making.	None stated.	Although the Council appreciates the point being raised. The Site Allocation is allocating the site for open space. It is not for the Site Allocation DPD to pre-empt what future circumstances may arise. The Council is satisfied that there are sufficient Development Plan policies, combined with the requirement of the NPPF, to ensure appropriate consideration/weight is given to meeting educational requirements on a case by case basis.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB4	Access direct from the A245 is likely to be problematic, due to the local constraints of the nearby Queens Avenue junction and the road embankment leading to the bridge over the M25. The site layout/design should provide as direct as possible a route from the development to local bus stops. It is suggested that air quality effects from the close by M25 be taken into consideration as existing houses adjacent to the M25 corridor to the north in Runnymede borough are within designated AQMAs. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy. In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB4 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB5	The development should provide a footway on the south side of Rectory Lane along the development site frontage and pedestrian crossing(s) to the existing footways opposite. Rectory Lane / Church Road local bus stops closest to the development site will require improvement by the developer. It is suggested that air quality effects from the close by M25	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>be taken into consideration as existing houses adjacent to the M25 corridor to the north in Runnymede borough are within designated AQMAs. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB5 is adjacent to two Areas of High Archaeological Potential, although these are currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.</p>			of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB6	It is suggested that, if not already done, the land-take of the proposed transport infrastructure improvement be established to fix the limit of the site red line or the junction be allocated without a fixed red line boundary.	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB7	The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB8	<p>New site access/ junction(s) onto A320 are likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Pedestrian facilities will be needed on the west side of the A320 along the site frontage and pedestrian/cyclist crossing(s) over the A320 will be needed to connect to existing pedestrian/cyclist facilities. The borough council is referred to the county council's transport response to the recently lodged planning application for development at this site.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB8 is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.</p>	None stated.	<p>The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.</p>	Add a key requirement that the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment
1240	Sue	Janota	GB9	<p>New site access/ junction(s) onto A320 are likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Pedestrian facilities will be needed on the west side of the A320 along the site frontage and pedestrian/cyclist crossing(s) over the A320 will be needed to connect to existing pedestrian/cyclist facilities. Additional bus stops along the A320 site frontage will be needed. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land uses subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB9 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.</p>	None stated.	<p>The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.</p>	Add a key requirement that the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment
1240	Sue	Janota	UA17	Concerns raised over the ability of the local narrow section of Goldsworth Road and the constrained Poole Road / Goldsworth Road junction to provide adequate vehicular access to the site	None stated.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA25	Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1240	Sue	Janota	UA32	No principle transport objections. UA32 is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential although this is currently under review there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.	Add a key requirement that the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment
1240	Sue	Janota	UA34	Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	UA35	No in principle transport objection to the proposed land uses and scale of development. However, it is recommended that the feasibility of the proposed fourth junction arm onto Monument Road / Albert Drive (Sheerwater Access Road) is tested before allocation is confirmed. Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	UA37	Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	None stated.	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	UA41	Concerned whether a single about single highway access (public highway connection at the A320 Guildford Road next to Victoria Arch) is capable of providing an adequate vehicular access to the site- particularly given the scale of the development proposed	None stated.	The comments are helpful and matters will inform the key requirements of the relevant proposals and also in particular when proposals come forward. The detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	UA49	It is recommended that the adequacy of the local road access to the site, between the A245 and the B385, is reviewed before allocation for industrial use is confirmed. Scotland Bridge Road is residential in character. Camphill Road has a substandard bridge over the Basingstoke Canal, a restricted three-way signalled tunnel under the railway, traffic calming at the southern end and a restricted right turn from the A245 / Camphill Road signalled junction. B1c development maybe more suited to these local road access constraints. Sites over 0.4ha need to be assessed in accordance with CS20	B1c development maybe more suited to these local road access constraints.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	UA51	No in principle transport objections to the proposed land uses. However, depending on the actual scale of development and number of additional vehicle trips, the adequacy and arrangement of the local road infrastructure within the town centre may need to be reviewed. There may be an opportunity for the southern side of the development site to give land towards improving the capacity constrained A245 / Station Approach / Pyrford Road / Camphill Road signalled junction. Proposal site UA51 is located within an Area of High	None stated.	The comments are helpful, detail measures will ultimately be considered and addressed as part of detailed transport assessment for the individual sites. Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all site is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement.	Add a key requirement that the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential and therefore proposals will need to submit an archaeological assessment

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.			
1240	Sue	Janota	General	Key issues for SCC to consider are the infrastructure implications, especially transport. The Strategic Transport Assessment has highlighted where increased stress is forecast on the road network and that there is a need to look in more detail at the A245 and B367 corridors and potential impacts in neighbouring boroughs. It is important that county officers work closely with borough officers, Highways England and developers to identify where mitigation measures will be needed and the types of potential solutions with indicative costs to update Woking's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will then review the Woking Borough Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme.	None stated.	<p>The Council welcomes representations from its adjoining authorities, and has engaged with relevant neighbouring authorities, statutory consultees and key stakeholders before and during the consultation period. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the authorities and other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. We will continue to involve them in all the key stages of the process.</p> <p>The Site Allocation is informed by the Strategic Transport Assessment and is committed to work positively with the County Council. This is fully expressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1240	Sue	Janota	GB10	There is a known Roman Road projected to run through the site. In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
1240	Sue	Janota	GB11	There is a known Roman Road projected to run through the site. In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	In line with CS20, the site is greater than 0.4 ha and as such an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary	Whilst the requirement for an archaeological assessment for all sites greater than 0.4 hectares is set out in Core Strategy policy CS20. The Council will add this to the Key Requirement of relevant sites.	Add a key requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the archaeological potential of the site
967	Rita	Jarvis	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. M25 closure lead to significant additional traffic. The medical facilities and Pyrford School are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Services such as Sewage, Gas, Electricity would be overloaded. Proposed expansion of Pyrford School doesn't include a safe drop off point. Construction lorries will be inconvenient for local residents. By using open Green Belt spaces there will be separation between places.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>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.</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
						<p>organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding views and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>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.</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 heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the comments made, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p>	
967	Rita	Jarvis	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. M25 closure lea to significant additional traffic. The medical facilities and Pyrford School are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Services such as Sewage, Gas, Electricity would be overloaded. Proposed expansion of Pyrford School doesn't include a safe drop off point. Construction lorries will be inconvenient for local residents. By using open Green Belt spaces there will be separation between places.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding views and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>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.</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 heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the comments made, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p>	
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	Disagree with the statements made in the SA that the proposals will support existing services/facilities and reduce the reliance on public transport (SA objective 2 and 5). Believes that the proposals will in fact exacerbate existing problems	None stated.	The Council is confident that the sustainability objective has been consistently assessed. The scoring has been explained in the 'comments' column of the assessment. The statement is based on the proximity of the site to local services and facilities however it is noted that the facilities are beyond reasonable walking distance, so although there is a positive score for objective 2, you will note that the score for this objective 5 is negative.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	Disagree with the statements made in the SA that the proposals will support existing services/facilities and reduce the reliance on public transport (SA objective 2 and 5). Believes that the proposals will in fact exacerbate existing problems	None stated.	The Council is confident that the sustainability objective has been consistently assessed. The scoring has been explained in the 'comments' column of the assessment. The statement is based on the proximity of the site to local services and facilities however it is noted that the facilities are beyond reasonable walking distance, so although there is a positive score for objective 2, you will note that the score for this objective 5 is negative.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	People are more likely to travel by car to local shops and facilities. The lack of pavements and busy roads would put people off from walking. If you observe the existing patterns, only a small percentage of residents would walk to local amenities. This is mainly down to convenience. Parking is limited in the centre and therefore an increase in population will mean more cars and chaos in the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	People are more likely to travel by car to local shops and facilities. The lack of pavements and busy roads would put people off from walking. If you observe the existing patterns, only a small percentage of residents would walk to local amenities. This is mainly down to convenience. Parking is limited in the centre and therefore an increase in population will mean more cars and chaos in the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	The proposed level of development will result in approximately 1000 additional cars in the area. The surrounding roads can not cope with the level of development. No consideration has been given to the effect of significant extra traffic. The proposal will further destroy the character of West Byfleet. The proposals are unacceptable and unsustainable	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	The proposed level of development will result in approximately 1000 additional cars in the area. The surrounding roads can not cope with the level of development. No consideration has been given to the effect of significant extra traffic. The proposal will further destroy the character of West Byfleet. The proposals are unacceptable and unsustainable	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	The Council should justify, with reasons, why it is changing the GB boundary. The NPPF sets out that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their PERMANENCE. Proposals will permanently destroy the openness	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	The Council should justify, with reasons, why it is changing the GB boundary. The NPPF sets out that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their PERMANENCE. Proposals will permanently destroy the openness	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	Believes there is inconsistency in the site assessments. SA objective 2 suggests that development will contribute to open space provision, however GB sites are already open and proposed development on GB can only result in less open space. Although they may make some open space more accessible, they will not be truly open in terms of open countryside and they will be too small. Improved access is not fundamental, the sites are important for their visual amenity and the value they add to the character of area- a tranquil, beautiful environment.	None stated.	It is also important to note that the SA objectives cover numerous objectives (17 in total). The Council believes that SA objective 2 has been consistently assessed. It is important to note that not all Green Belt land is accessible open space or even greenfield, some areas of Green Belt comprise of built structures. There is not always a direct correlation between Green Belt, open space and improved health. Each site has been assessed with a clear explanation in the 'comments' column of the SA table.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	Disagree with the statements made in the SA that the proposals will support the provision of open space. The proposals will result in the loss of open spaces designated as GB. The remaining areas of open spaces will be so small that they would be insignificant.	None stated.	It is also important to note that the SA objectives cover numerous objectives (17 in total). The Council believes that SA objective 2 has been consistently assessed. It is important to note that not all Green Belt land is accessible open space or even greenfield, some areas of Green Belt comprise of built structures. There is not always a direct correlation between Green Belt, open space and improved health. Each site has been assessed with a clear explanation in the 'comments' column of the SA table.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	The ability of the area to accommodate the proposals based on local infrastructure is queried. Pre school, primary and secondary schools are at capacity in the area. It is fundamental that proposals make provision for schools for them to be sustainable. Other services and facilities including health/medical practices are at full. The capacity of utilities is also questioned.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	The ability of the area to accommodate the proposals based on local infrastructure is queried. Pre school, primary and secondary schools are at capacity in the area. It is fundamental that proposals make provision for schools for them to be sustainable. Other services and facilities including health/medical practices are at full. The capacity of utilities is also questioned.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB12	The walking times set out (SA objective 5) are not realistic except for maybe very fit adults. The distances to the GP (1.5 miles), local secondary school (2.3 miles) and Woking town centre (2.6 miles) are too far for walking and it is more likely that people will drive.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1244	Stuart	Jarvis	GB13	The walking times set out (SA objective 5) are not realistic except for maybe very fit adults. The distances to the GP (1.5 miles), local secondary school (2.3 miles) and Woking town centre (2.6 miles) are too far for walking and it is more likely that people will drive.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	Object to building on Green Belt in Byfleet. The A245 will be gridlocked.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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>Whilst there is likely to be some disruption during construction, the impact of this can be mitigated through planning conditions and would be relatively short term.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	Object to building on Green Belt in Byfleet. The A245 will be gridlocked.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<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>Whilst there is likely to be some disruption during construction, the impact of this can be mitigated through planning conditions and would be relatively short term.</p>	
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	Much of Byfleet and the proposed development area has already flooded or is in danger of flooding. New development will increase risk.	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
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	Much of Byfleet and the proposed development area has already flooded or is in danger of flooding. New development will increase risk.	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
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	The council has always dumped on the people of Byfleet, by depositing drug addicts and benefit cheats in the village in particular Eden Grove Road.	None stated.	<p>This is not a planning matter. The allocation of Council housing across the Borough is determined by Housing Services.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council treats all people equally and has a responsibility to house all members of the community.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	The council has always dumped on the people of Byfleet, by depositing drug addicts and benefit cheats in the village in particular Eden Grove Road.	None stated.	<p>This is not a planning matter. The allocation of Council housing across the Borough is determined by Housing Services.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council treats all people equally and has a responsibility to house all members of the community.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	Drainage is inadequate and local roads flood in bad weather.	None stated.	<p>The issue with flooding on Brewery Road is well documented with Thames Water currently working on a permanent solution to the on-going problem.</p> <p>The representation regarding wider drainage issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	Drainage is inadequate and local roads flood in bad weather.	None stated.	<p>The issue with flooding on Brewery Road is well documented with Thames Water currently working on a permanent solution to the on-going problem.</p> <p>The representation regarding wider drainage issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	The petition with over 2,500 names has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	The petition with over 2,500 names has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	There are many unused offices that should be considered to preserve Green Belt	Develop underused office buildings before using Green Belt land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	There are many unused offices that should be considered to preserve Green Belt	Develop underused office buildings before using Green Belt land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	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 suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>The Council's assessment of brownfield sites for development is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</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
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	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 suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>The Council's assessment of brownfield sites for development is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</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
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	The private school at Broadoaks will not cater for the less well off, but rather the wealthy	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	The private school at Broadoaks will not cater for the less well off, but rather the wealthy	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	
851	Pete	Jenner	GB4	Have not dealt the existing issues in the village. Are surrounded by undesirables and parking is atrocious.	None stated.	The Council treats all members of the community equally. 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
851	Pete	Jenner	GB5	Have not dealt the existing issues in the village. Are surrounded by undesirables and parking is atrocious.	None stated.	The Council treats all members of the community equally. 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
647	A	Jennings	GB4	Authorities should accept that Surrey is 'Full and we are Fed up' and development and infrastructure needs to be found elsewhere to solve the problem.	None stated.	This is not the approach that the Council has chosen to take, as is evident in the Core Strategy, adopted in 2012. The justification for release of Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need is detailed in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB5	Authorities should accept that Surrey is 'Full and we are Fed up' and development and infrastructure needs to be found elsewhere to solve the problem.	None stated.	This is not the approach that the Council has chosen to take, as is evident in the Core Strategy, adopted in 2012. The justification for release of Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need is detailed in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB4	2. There is no infrastructure in place or proposals to help with healthcare. Waiting times to see a Doctor are already very long.	None stated.	This representation has been partly addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB5	2. There is no infrastructure in place or proposals to help with healthcare. Waiting times to see a Doctor are already very long.	None stated.	This representation has been partly addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB4	3. Most residents in Byfleet were affected as a result of winter floods in 2012-13. Further building on the flood plains will worsen this. Flooded drains in Brewery Lane, High Road and the Parvis Road/ High Road corner are a danger to residents when it rains.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, paragraphs 5.1-5.6. Paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 are particularly relevant with regard to ensuring the development of these sites does not exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB5	3. Most residents in Byfleet were affected as a result of winter floods in 2012-13. Further building on the flood plains will worsen this. Flooded drains in Brewery Lane, High Road and the Parvis Road/ High Road corner are a danger to residents when it rains.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, paragraphs 5.1-5.6. Paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 are particularly relevant with regard to ensuring the development of these sites does not exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB4	4. We are a close community and the petition signed by over 2500 people gives an idea of the unity of feeling, that cannot be ignored.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
647	A	Jennings	GB5	4. We are a close community and the petition signed by over 2500 people gives an idea of the unity of feeling, that cannot be ignored.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
647	A	Jennings	GB4	5. There is very little Green Belt left in Byfleet and the proposals will virtually eliminate the remainder. This is unacceptable.	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	No further modification is 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 (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.	
647	A	Jennings	GB5	5. There is very little Green Belt left in Byfleet and the proposals will virtually eliminate the remainder. This is unacceptable.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB4	With recent changes in Government Policy, surely brownfield sites and conversion of office/ industrial to housing is preferred.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB5	With recent changes in Government Policy, surely brownfield sites and conversion of office/ industrial to housing is preferred.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
647	A	Jennings	GB4	Objects on the following grounds: 1. Surveys show Parvis Road (A245) is virtually unusable for 6 hours during the day during commuting times. This is without the proposed developments.	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 comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
647	A	Jennings	GB5	Objects on the following grounds: 1. Surveys show Parvis Road (A245) is virtually unusable for 6 hours during the day during commuting times. This is without the proposed developments.	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>	No further modification is 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.	
1213	Jan I	Jennings	General	During the Winter of 2012/2013 Byfleet was featured had extensive flooding on part of the allocated housing areas for development. The village has three areas of roads and pavements that regularly flood with slight rainfall.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1213	Jan I	Jennings	General	Byfleet residents' petition of over 2500 named persons has been ignored. Byfleet has very little Green Belt left, this development would unfairly erode this resource even more.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Council 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
1213	Jan I	Jennings	General	object to release of Green Belt land because there is no infrastructure to support further development (A245 road, schooling, hospitals, and the medical centre has long waiting times).	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section. See Section 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB12	More elderly facilities are required. There needs to be suitable downsizing apartments for local residents who want to downsize and stay in the area	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied. There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB13	More elderly facilities are required. There needs to be suitable downsizing apartments for local residents who want to downsize and stay in the area	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied. There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						(SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB12	Concerned about overpopulation- proposals will adversely impact local infrastructure. In particular road infrastructure- which is already often congested.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure and the road infrastructure, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB13	Concerned about overpopulation- proposals will adversely impact local infrastructure. In particular road infrastructure- which is already often congested.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure and the road infrastructure, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB12	Concerned that proposals will have an adverse impact on the strong community spirit.	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>There is a significant unmet need for housing and it was acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.</p> <p>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>It is important to note that zero growth is not a reasonable alternative option given the significant unmet need in the borough and the surrounding area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB13	Concerned that proposals will have an adverse impact on the strong community spirit.	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>There is a significant unmet need for housing and it was acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.</p> <p>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>It is important to note that zero growth is not a reasonable alternative option given the significant unmet need in the borough and the surrounding area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB12	<p>People have moved to the area for Pyrford Primary School which has an outstanding reputation and strong academic success.</p> <p>The planned expansion of the school is based on current demands. 433 new homes will require additional need for school places.</p> <p>Nursery and Pre-school facilities are at capacity.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council supports the successes achieved by Pyrford Primary School, protecting academic achievement is not a Planning issue.</p> <p>With regards to school provision please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB13	<p>People have moved to the area for Pyrford Primary School which has an outstanding reputation and strong academic success.</p> <p>The planned expansion of the school is based on current demands. 433 new homes will require additional need for school places.</p> <p>Nursery and Pre-school facilities are at capacity.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council supports the successes achieved by Pyrford Primary School, protecting academic achievement is not a Planning issue.</p> <p>With regards to school provision please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB12	Concerned that proposals will predominantly impact the east of the Borough. People have moved into the area for its charming character, easy access to the surrounding natural lancape and unspoilt countryside.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
444	Anthony	Jessup	GB13	Concerned that proposals will predominantly impact the east of the Borough. People have moved into the area for its charming character, easy access to the surrounding natural lancape and unspoilt countryside.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB12	More elderly facilities are required. There needs to be suitable downsizing apartments for local residents who want to downsize and stay in the area	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.</p> <p>There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB13	More elderly facilities are required. There needs to be suitable downsizing apartments for local residents who want to downsize and stay in the area	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.</p> <p>There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB12	Concerned about overpopulation- proposals will adversely impact local infrastructure. In particular road infrastructure- which is already often congested.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure and the road infrastructure, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB13	Concerned about overpopulation- proposals will adversely impact local infrastructure. In particular road infrastructure- which is already often congested.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure and the road infrastructure, is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB12	Concerned that proposals will have an adverse impact on the strong community spirit which is the result of the pleasant environment that exists. This can not be easily recreated. Object to housing proposals between 2015 and 2040.	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>There is a significant unmet need for housing and it was acknowledged at the preparation of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.</p> <p>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>It is important to note that zero growth is not a reasonable alternative option given the significant unmet need in the borough and the surrounding area.</p>	
445	Amii	Jessup	GB13	<p>Concerned that proposals will have an adverse impact on the strong community spirit which is built around the pleasant environment that exists currently. This can not be easily recreated.</p> <p>Object to proposals to meet housing requirement between 2015-2040.</p>	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>There is a significant unmet need for housing and it was acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.</p> <p>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>It is important to note that zero growth is not a reasonable alternative option given the significant unmet need in the borough and the surrounding area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB12	<p>People have moved to the area for Pyrford Primary School which has an outstanding reputation and strong academic success.</p> <p>The planned expansion of the school is based on current demands. 433 new homes will require additional need for school places.</p> <p>Nursery and Pre-school facilities are at capacity.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council supports the successes achieved by Pyrford Primary School, protecting academic achievement is not a Planning issue.</p> <p>With regards to school provision please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB13	<p>People have moved to the area for Pyrford Primary School which has an outstanding reputation and strong academic success.</p> <p>The planned expansion of the school is based on current demands. 433 new homes will require additional need for school places.</p> <p>Nursery and Pre-school facilities are at capacity.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council supports the successes achieved by Pyrford Primary School, protecting academic achievement is not a Planning issue.</p> <p>With regards to school provision please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
445	Amii	Jessup	GB12	<p>Concerned that proposals will predominantly impact the east of the Borough.</p> <p>People have moved into the area for its charming character, easy access to the surrounding natural lancape and unspoilt countryside.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
445	Amii	Jessup	GB13	Concerned that proposals will predominantly impact the east of the Borough. People have moved into the area for its charming character, easy access to the surrounding natural lancape and unspoilt countryside.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0, 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - no urban sites have been considered and there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Supportive of the school proposal and the mitigation measures for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, flooding and safety measures.	None stated.	Support for the proposed school, subject to mitigation measures, noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Objects to the leisure centre and all other leisure related facilities on the site. Inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's 800m separation policy.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities	No further modification is 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 residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Object to housing - would fill in any gap between Mayford and Woking and increasing the risk of Woking merging with Guildford, which is against the purposes of Green Belt.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Object to housing - would fill in any gap between Mayford and Woking and increasing the risk of Woking merging with Guildford, which is against the purposes of Green Belt.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Object to housing - would fill in any gap between Mayford and Woking and increasing the risk of Woking merging with Guildford, which is against the purposes of Green Belt.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Object to housing - would fill in any gap between Mayford and Woking and increasing the risk of Woking merging with Guildford, which is against the purposes of Green Belt.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	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>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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	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>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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	General	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	NPPF states that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - this has not been demonstrated by WBC. 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	NPPF states that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - this has not been demonstrated by WBC. 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	NPPF states that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - this has not been demonstrated by WBC. 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	NPPF states that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - this has not been demonstrated by WBC. 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	The traffic situation will be significantly worse with 5000 visits per week.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Operating hours will have a major impact on adjacent residents and within the local area. A totally inappropriate proposal and its association with the school proposal represents a very unfortunate lack of transparency on behalf	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.	No further modification is 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 Council.		The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.	
681	Rob	Jewkes	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	GBBR indicates that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading and is a Trojan horse to building housing on the adjacent fiel.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	GBBR indicates that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading and is a Trojan horse to building housing on the adjacent fiel.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	A Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	A Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	A Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	A Lancap 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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Saunders Lane is not suitable for the expected increase in vehicle numbers due to it being narrow, bounded by a single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points.			
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p> <p>Saunders Lane is not suitable for the expected increase in vehicle numbers due to it being narrow, bounded by a single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p> <p>Saunders Lane is not suitable for the expected increase in vehicle numbers due to it being narrow, bounded by a single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p> <p>Saunders Lane is not suitable for the expected increase in vehicle numbers due to it being narrow, bounded by a single lane bridge and tunnel pinch points.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor the impact on the semi-rural character of Mayford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor the impact on the semi-rural character of Mayford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor the impact on the semi-rural character of Mayford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor the impact on the semi-rural character of Mayford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns. The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns. The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns. The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns. The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	Sites should have amenity space and business related space. The site is in close proximity to homes and two Grade	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				II Listed buildings. Traveller related businesses are out of keeping with the area.			of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	Traveller sites should have good access to schools and other facilities, this sites does not.	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB7	Where no other urban sites are identified, priority should be given to edge of urban area sites with good access to services. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	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
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
681	Rob	Jewkes	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	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	No further modification is 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>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>	
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature and would remove 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	The Green Belt boundary will be weaker as it does not follow a motorway, district road, railway line, river or prominent physical feature and would remove 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Development would take away green space which everyone is entitled to.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that access to green space is important. The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).</p> <p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Development would take away green space which everyone is entitled to.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that access to green space is important. The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council accepts that the 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.	
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB7	Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Objects to housing on this site - 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Objects to housing on this site - 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	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	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
						also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	The traffic situation will be significantly worse and there are no public footpaths on some of the roads. This will be made worse with other developments taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Development would wipe out wildlife and endanger wildlife on the 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. 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Development would wipe out wildlife and endanger wildlife on the 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. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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>	
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB8	No major objections to the school. Strongly object to the commercialisation of the site (leisure building). The school development is covering this up and will have a big impact on the infrastructure which is under stress.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant the associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and the County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB9	Strongly object to the site being used for commercial infrastructure. The site maintains a gap between Woking and Mayford and will be lost if developed. It will also have a big impact on roads due to the existing traffic and lack of transport infrastructure. Passing the problem onto Surrey County Council is unacceptable and passing the buck.	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation does not propose a large scale commercial centre within the site. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and serve the day to day needs of local people. The proposed allocations set around Mayford 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 site has the opportunity to compliment the existing retail and/or community facilities in the area in order to continue to serve the day to day needs of local people. The likely nature of this small scale retail and/or community facilities is not likely to generate more traffic than the existing commercial uses on the site. Nevertheless, the Council has stated in the DPD that a Transport Assessment will be required as well as setting out a number of potential transport infrastructure issues that may need to be addressed as part of any future development.</p> <p>The Council is working with the County Council in identifying the transport impact of the proposed allocations. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	GBBR indicates that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading and is a Trojan horse to building housing on the adjacent fiel.	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	GBBR indicates that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading and is a Trojan horse to building housing on the adjacent fiel.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	A Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	A Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	<p>Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking nor the impact on the character of the village</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking nor the impact on the character of the village	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB9	The site boundary is drawn to include the highway verge to Egley Road, to provide a strong defensible boundary. This is setting a dangerous precedent for the future and the demolition of the Green Belt.	None stated.	Paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The Council believes it has followed this part of the NPPF by drawing the Green Belt boundary to the edge of Egley Road, a defined boundary which is likely to be permanent. By removing site GB8 and GB9 from the Green Belt, the grass verge would not serve any of the purposes of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. Overall the Council believes that its approach to allocating and safeguarding sites for development will ensure the Green Belt boundary will be of enduring permanence well beyond the Plan period, as set out in the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	This representation 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	This representation 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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area, which would not be able to support the increase in traffic. One bridge serves Worplesdon Station which would increase 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	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
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
682	Sally	Jewkes	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
683	Kate	Jewkes	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
683	Kate	Jewkes	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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 community will lose its independence and the historic town and its 'special character' will be engulfed by Woking.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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 community will lose its independence and the historic town and its 'special character' will be engulfed by Woking.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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 community will lose its independence and the historic town and its 'special character' will be engulfed by Woking.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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 community will lose its independence and the historic town and its 'special character' will be engulfed by Woking.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	General	Desperately urge to 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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB8	Object to housing on all of the above sites. The purpose of Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The GBBR stated that Woking does not have a particularly strong historical character, however Mayford does 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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB9	Object to housing on all of the above sites. The purpose of Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The GBBR stated that Woking does not have	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				a particularly strong historical character, however Mayford does and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.		<p>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>	
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB10	Object to housing on all of the above sites. The purpose of Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The GBBR stated that Woking does not have a particularly strong historical character, however Mayford does and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB11	Object to housing on all of the above sites. The purpose of Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The GBBR stated that Woking does not have a particularly strong historical character, however Mayford does and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Astonished that this is not a prerequisite to releasing Green Belt land for development.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Astonished that this is not a prerequisite to releasing Green Belt land for development.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Astonished that this is not a prerequisite to releasing Green Belt land for development.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Astonished that this is not a prerequisite to releasing Green Belt land for development.	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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. 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'.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</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 and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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 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>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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).	
683	Kate	Jewkes	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. 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'.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</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 and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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 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>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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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. 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'.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</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 and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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 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>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
683	Kate	Jewkes	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. Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</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 and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				'Important Bird Areas'.		<p>Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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 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>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>	
683	Kate	Jewkes	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
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. 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. 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. Combined this will increase the risk of fatal accidents.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
683	Kate	Jewkes	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. 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. 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. Combined this will increase the risk of	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB8	The disappearance of the Green Belt will lead to the loss of physical separation between towns and villages, and them merging into one large towns, much against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. 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
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB9	The disappearance of the Green Belt will lead to the loss of physical separation between towns and villages, and them merging into one large towns, much against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. 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
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB10	The disappearance of the Green Belt will lead to the loss of physical separation between towns and villages, and them merging into one large towns, much against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. 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
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB11	The disappearance of the Green Belt will lead to the loss of physical separation between towns and villages, and them merging into one large towns, much against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. 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
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB14	The disappearance of the Green Belt will lead to the loss of physical separation between towns and villages, and them merging into one large towns, much against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0. 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
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB10	The proposed density of 12 houses per acre will be 3 times the current density in adjoining Hook Heath. This change is far too excessive.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB11	The proposed density of 12 houses per acre will be 3 times the current density in adjoining Hook Heath. This change is far too excessive.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB8	The proposals for new housing, school, athletics track, leisure facilities and extended hours business and retail park would bring extreme congestion to already congested roads, particularly at peak times. The infrastructure is unsustainable for such large scale development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB9	The proposals for new housing, school, athletics track, leisure facilities and extended hours business and retail park would bring extreme congestion to already congested roads, particularly at peak times. The infrastructure is unsustainable for such large scale development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB10	The proposals for new housing, school, athletics track, leisure facilities and extended hours business and retail park would bring extreme congestion to already congested roads, particularly at peak times. The infrastructure is unsustainable for such large scale development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB8	Strongly opposed to the proposals as Green Belt areas should be considered as the last resort for housing development, if brownfield sites have been fully developed and further that 'exceptional circumstances' as in national policy have to proved. This has not been demonstrated by WBC.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Detail on the assessment of reasonable alternative, including brownfield, sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB9	Strongly opposed to the proposals as Green Belt areas should be considered as the last resort for housing development, if brownfield sites have been fully developed and further that 'exceptional circumstances' as in national policy have to proved. This has not been demonstrated by WBC.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Detail on the assessment of reasonable alternative, including brownfield, sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB10	Strongly opposed to the proposals as Green Belt areas should be considered as the last resort for housing development, if brownfield sites have been fully developed and further that 'exceptional circumstances' as in national policy have to proved. This has not been demonstrated by WBC.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Detail on the assessment of reasonable alternative, including brownfield, sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1434	S, J.R.	Jeyam	GB11	Strongly opposed to the proposals as Green Belt areas should be considered as the last resort for housing development, if brownfield sites have been fully developed and further that 'exceptional circumstances' as in national policy have to proved. This has not been demonstrated by WBC.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Detail on the assessment of reasonable alternative, including brownfield, sites can be found in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.		enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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.	
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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.	
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	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
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Working Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	the DPD for the reasons stated.	accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1456	Glenn	Johnson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancscape 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	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 best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	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 best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancaple importance have 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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	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
1458	Peter	Johnson	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
1458	Peter	Johnson	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
1458	Peter	Johnson	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
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.		
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. This is further detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process.	
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development will be supported by adequate infrastructure 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.	
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.			
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be	The site should be	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	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
				expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancscape grounds. The Lancscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	of this representation
1458	Peter	Johnson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancscape 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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have 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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have 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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have 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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	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
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and character.			
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. This is further detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancap Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	stated.	<p>minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.</p> <p>This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mayford.	the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from	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	No further modification is 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 DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially	The site should be removed from the DPD for	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	the reasons stated.	necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1459	Shirley	Johnson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						viable.	
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				should Mayford develop further.			
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours,	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.		address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancape importance have 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancape importance have 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancape importance have 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of Lancape importance have 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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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.	
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	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
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the reasons stated.		
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. This is further detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet	The site should be	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.		of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that	No further modification is 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 DPD for the reasons stated.	increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an 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.	of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				as a Traveller site.			
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1460	Andrew	Johnson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancscape 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
965	Anna	Johnston	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Will negatively affect the character of Pyrford. The Green Belt is needed and valued.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
965	Anna	Johnston	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Will negatively affect the character of Pyrford. The Green Belt is needed and valued.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The SADPD fails the four tests of soundness of the NPPF because it is not positively prepared as the Borough's housing needs are not met; not based on an up-to-date and NPPF compliant SHMA; will not deliver enough new homes; not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; has not identified or responded to objectively assessed need.	None stated.	The Councils disagrees. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The SADPD fails the four tests of soundness of the NPPF because it is not positively prepared as the Borough's housing needs are not met; not based on an up-to-date and NPPF compliant SHMA; will not deliver enough new homes; not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; has not identified or responded to objectively assessed need.	None stated.	The Councils disagrees. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	<p>The site's traffic impact would be minor. Initial capacity studies show the site will not have a severe impact on highways capacity.</p> <p>There is some capacity constraint predicted along the Wych Hill Lane corridor in the future, but site movements will be negligible compared to existing flows. No significant impacts at further afield junctions are expected.</p> <p>SCC's Strategic Transport Assessment (January 2015) identifies the main areas of traffic concern being Byfleet and in comparison capacity constraint in Mayford is limited. The STA does not highlight Egley Road as a link likely to be severely impacted by future development, which will be the main corridor for May ford developments.</p> <p>Discussions with SCC have agreed the following: One point of vehicular access to site GB10 and to GB11 is acceptable, with priority junctions from Saunders Lane; Development related traffic on the B380 railway bridge and Mayford Green Roundabout is likely to be accommodated in an acceptable manner; impacts further afield likely to be negligible; and the location of the site is sustainable and improvements to sustainable transport links will be undertaken.</p>	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	<p>The site's traffic impact would be minor. Initial capacity studies show the site will not have a severe impact on highways capacity.</p> <p>There is some capacity constraint predicted along the Wych Hill Lane corridor in the future, but site movements will be negligible compared to existing flows. No significant impacts at further afield junctions are expected.</p> <p>SCC's Strategic Transport Assessment (January 2015) identifies the main areas of traffic concern being Byfleet and in comparison capacity constraint in Mayford is limited. The STA does not highlight Egley Road as a link likely to be severely impacted by future development, which will be the main corridor for May ford developments.</p> <p>Discussions with SCC have agreed the following: One point of vehicular access to site GB10 and to GB11 is acceptable, with priority junctions from Saunders Lane; Development related traffic on the B380 railway bridge and Mayford Green Roundabout is likely to be accommodated in an acceptable manner; impacts further afield likely to be negligible; and the location of the site is sustainable and improvements to sustainable transport links will be undertaken.</p>	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	<p>Each site can have safe road junctions access on to Saunders Lane. SCC have confirmed access arrangements are suitable. There have been no recorded accidents in the vicinity of the proposed site access within the past 5 years. Site footpaths will connect to existing Saunders Lane footpath and pedestrian road crossings can be provided. Improved site accessibility by pedestrian and cycle links to public transport and local centre can be provided.</p> <p>[Transport access and linkages plan supplied]</p>	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	<p>Each site can have safe road junctions access on to Saunders Lane. SCC have confirmed access arrangements are suitable. There have been no recorded accidents in the vicinity of the proposed site access within the past 5 years. Site footpaths will connect to existing Saunders Lane footpath and pedestrian road crossings can be provided. Improved site accessibility by pedestrian and cycle links to public transport and local centre can be provided.</p> <p>[Transport access and linkages plan supplied]</p>	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	There are no overriding ecological constraints to prevent developing the site for housing. CSa have undertaken ecological surveys including a desk study and extended Phase 1 habitat survey which conclude any potential impacts can be mitigated. Ecological enhancement can be achieved through landscaping. There will be no direct impacts to statutory or non-statutory wildlife sites from developing the site.	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	There are no overriding ecological constraints to prevent developing the site for housing. CSa have undertaken ecological surveys including a desk study and extended Phase 1 habitat survey which conclude any potential impacts can be mitigated. Ecological enhancement can be achieved through landscaping. There will be no direct impacts to statutory or non-statutory wildlife sites from developing the site.	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Viability on previously developed land is an issue and could affect the delivery of affordable housing, therefore more sites like GB10 and GB11 are required to deliver the Council's affordable housing requirements.	None stated.	Delivery of affordable housing will be through the implementation of Core Strategy Policy CS12. Nevertheless the representation is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Viability on previously developed land is an issue and could affect the delivery of affordable housing, therefore more sites like GB10 and GB11 are required to deliver the Council's affordable housing requirements.	None stated.	Delivery of affordable housing will be through the implementation of Core Strategy Policy CS12. Nevertheless the representation is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The majority of urban sites are for flats however the SHMA identified the greatest need for housing being 2-4 houses. Without releasing Green Belt sites earlier only flats will be built and increase the need for family housing.	None stated.	Delivery of affordable housing will be through the implementation of Core Strategy Policy CS12. Nevertheless the representation is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The majority of urban sites are for flats however the SHMA identified the greatest need for housing being 2-4 houses. Without releasing Green Belt sites earlier only flats will be built and increase the need for family housing.	None stated.	Delivery of affordable housing will be through the implementation of Core Strategy Policy CS12. Nevertheless the representation is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore suitable for housing.	None stated.	Comments noted the site is located in Flood Zone 1, as outlined in the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore suitable for housing.	None stated.	Comments noted the site is located in Flood Zone 1, as outlined in the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Sites GB10 and GB11 are singularly owned and should come forward independently, references to sites GB8, GB9 and GB14 should be removed within the supporting text to the allocation. The reference to an equalisation agreement should be removed as it is not appropriate. Affordable housing should be subject to viability and with an option to be delivered off-site.	None stated.	The Council's affordable housing requirement is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS12 as well as the Affordable Housing Delivery SPD. This is highlighted in the key requirements for the site. The exact type, nature and siting of affordable housing for each site will be determined on a case by case basis at the planning application stage. There is therefore no need to amend or remove the reference to affordable housing provision. 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Sites GB10 and GB11 are singularly owned and should come forward independently, references to sites GB8, GB9 and GB14 should be removed within the supporting text to the allocation. The reference to an equalisation agreement should be removed as it is not appropriate. Affordable housing should be subject to viability and with an option to be delivered off-site.	None stated.	The Council's affordable housing requirement is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS12 as well as the Affordable Housing Delivery SPD. This is highlighted in the key requirements for the site. The exact type, nature and siting of affordable housing for each site will be determined on a case by case basis at the planning application stage. There is therefore no need to amend or remove the reference to affordable housing provision. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						or any other means of arrangement that will ensure effective integration and access to this infrastructure will be required.	
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB8	References to GB10 and GB11 should be deleted as these sites can be delivered independently and there is no planning policy justification to link the sites with an equalisation agreement.	None stated.	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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB9	References to GB10 and GB11 should be deleted as these sites can be delivered independently and there is no planning policy justification to link the sites with an equalisation agreement.	None stated.	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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB14	References to GB10 and GB11 should be deleted as these sites can be delivered independently and there is no planning policy justification to link the sites with an equalisation agreement.	None stated.	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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	GB10 and GB11 should be delivered before 2027 to meet the Borough's housing needs and make the plan sound.	None stated.	The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land this 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	GB10 and GB11 should be delivered before 2027 to meet the Borough's housing needs and make the plan sound.	None stated.	The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land this 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	<p>MGH owns GB10 and GB11 (site map included). Outlines when previous representations have been made to the Council.</p> <p>The sites are in single ownership and development will be planned comprehensively.</p> <p>The sites were identified as suitable for housing in the SHLAA and GBBR. They are in a sustainable location with good access to key local services and WTC.</p> <p>MGH have undertaken technical studies which support the delivery of the site for houses. There are no known constraints relating to highways, ecology, landscaping, flood risk or contamination.</p> <p>According to Council evidence the site has been deemed suitable for release for housing development post 2027.</p> <p>The site was previously granted on appeal planning permission for 180 dwellings, upheld by the Secretary of State, which was quashed at the High Court due to the designation of the land. At that time, it was not felt that the proposed development of the site would extend development beyond the limits of existing development.</p> <p>Outlines an indicative masterplan for the sites and the Council land between GB10 and GB11, demonstrating the sites can deliver c.380 dwellings and open space independent, but not precluding, other Mayford sites.</p>	None stated.	Whilst the Council welcomes additional information in support for the site. The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	<p>MGH owns GB10 and GB11 (site map included). Outlines when previous representations have been made to the Council.</p> <p>The sites are in single ownership and development will be planned comprehensively.</p> <p>The sites were identified as suitable for housing in the SHLAA and GBBR. They are in a sustainable location with</p>	None stated.	Whilst the Council welcomes additional information in support for the site. The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>good access to key local services and WTC. MGH have undertaken technical studies which support the delivery of the site for houses. There are no known constraints relating to highways, ecology, landscaping, flood risk or contamination.</p> <p>According to Council evidence the site has been deemed suitable for release for housing development post 2027. The site was previously granted on appeal planning permission for 180 dwellings, upheld by the Secretary of State, which was quashed at the High Court due to the designation of the land. At that time, it was not felt that the proposed development of the site would extend development beyond the limits of existing development.</p> <p>Outlines an indicative masterplan for the sites and the Council land between GB10 and GB11, demonstrating the sites can deliver c.380 dwellings and open space independent, but not precluding, other Mayford sites.</p>			
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	<p>Undertaken a lancape and visual appraisal which identified opportunities for views are limited and localised. Residential development will not have significant visual effect. The site boundaries are robust and development will be well contained, not impacting the wider countryside. The Council has identified the Green Belt necessary for future housing therefore the sites will not impact urban regeneration.</p> <p>The site lies within Policy CS24 designation. The policy permits development on the slopes of escarpments where it would not adversely affect the character of the lancape. CSa's lancape and visual appraisal concurs the findings of the GBBR assessment that the site has robust boundaries and housing will not result in a material lancape effect and will not compromise the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	None stated.	The Council will review additional information submitted in support for the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	<p>Undertaken a lancape and visual appraisal which identified opportunities for views are limited and localised. Residential development will not have significant visual effect. The site boundaries are robust and development will be well contained, not impacting the wider countryside. The Council has identified the Green Belt necessary for future housing therefore the sites will not impact urban regeneration.</p> <p>The site lies within Policy CS24 designation. The policy permits development on the slopes of escarpments where it would not adversely affect the character of the lancape. CSa's lancape and visual appraisal concurs the findings of the GBBR assessment that the site has robust boundaries and housing will not result in a material lancape effect and will not compromise the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	None stated.	The Council will review additional information submitted in support for the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	<p>There is a conflict between the employment and housing strategy of Core Strategy and SADPD as Core Strategy Policy CS2 allocates additional office and retail space however the SADPD allocated retail and employment land to residential uses.</p> <p>Some strategic employment sites are identified for partial conversion to residential against the objectives of the ELS and CS.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any contradictions. The Council has sought to identify suitable sites for various uses.</p> <p>Core Strategy policy CS2 for the Town Centre supports the mixed use high density redevelopment of existing sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	<p>There is a conflict between the employment and housing strategy of Core Strategy and SADPD as Core Strategy Policy CS2 allocates additional office and retail space however the SADPD allocated retail and employment land to residential uses.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any contradictions. The Council has sought to identify suitable sites for various uses.</p> <p>Core Strategy policy CS2 for the Town Centre supports the mixed use high density redevelopment of existing 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
				Some strategic employment sites are identified for partial conversion to residential against the objectives of the ELS and CS.			
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Supports the Council in identifying development sites, specifically GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Supports the Council in identifying development sites, specifically GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Supports release of Green Belt for residential. Objects to the timing of release for Green Belt sites. Site constraints on both urban sites and some Green Belt sites will mean not all sites will come forward during the plan period. Therefore, the plan needs to identify additional sites to housing to deliver the Core Strategy or even higher housing figures. The strategy to develop high density urban sites will not deliver enough family or affordable housing. Greater flexibility should be incorporated into the wording for the delivery of Green Belt sites to allow them to come forward sooner if the housing need arises.	None stated.	The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land this 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Supports release of Green Belt for residential. Objects to the timing of release for Green Belt sites. Site constraints on both urban sites and some Green Belt sites will mean not all sites will come forward during the plan period. Therefore, the plan needs to identify additional sites to housing to deliver the Core Strategy or even higher housing figures. The strategy to develop high density urban sites will not deliver enough family or affordable housing. Greater flexibility should be incorporated into the wording for the delivery of Green Belt sites to allow them to come forward sooner if the housing need arises.	None stated.	The Council can demonstrate sufficient supply of land to meet the housing need up to 2022. The approach taken by the Council with regards to the proposed timescales to release Green Belt land this 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Outlines the requirement of the NPPF and PPG. The Core Strategy housing evidence base and policy is not compliant with NPPF. The Council did not undertake a full needs assessment before setting housing targets. The adopted approach is supply driven based around constraints. The 2009 SHMA did not take into account CLG household projections, economic growth or market signals therefore it does not fully assess housing need to meet the requirements of the NPPF. Gives examples of recent case law to indicate the Core Strategy housing policy and evidence base should not have been found sound. The 2014 SHMA methodology is consistent with the NPPF and PPG and identifies a similar housing need to the 2009 SHMA of 390-588 dpa. The housing target should be increased and met through the SADPD.	None stated.	This has been comprehensively addressed in an earlier part of the Council's response	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Outlines the requirement of the NPPF and PPG. The Core Strategy housing evidence base and policy is not compliant with NPPF. The Council did not undertake a full needs assessment before setting housing targets. The adopted approach is supply driven based around constraints. The 2009 SHMA did not take into account CLG household	None stated.	This has been comprehensively addressed in an earlier part of the Council's response	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				projections, economic growth or market signals therefore it does not fully assess housing need to meet the requirements of the NPPF. Gives examples of recent case law to indicate the Core Strategy housing policy and evidence base should not have been found sound. The 2014 SHMA methodology is consistent with the NPPF and PPG and identifies a similar housing need to the 2009 SHMA of 390-588 dpa. The housing target should be increased and met through the SADPD.			
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	There is a lack of evidence to support the deliverability of sites, loss of employment sites, type of housing needed, amount of affordable housing to be delivered and viability of. The SADPD fails to allocate sufficient housing land. The Core Strategy housing target is not based on robust NPPF compliant evidence base, the actual figure is closer to 590 dpa.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by robust evidence, including, the Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal Report, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Transport Assessment and other evidence base listed in Appendix 1 of the DPD. In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate the input of key stakeholders such as the County Council, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have been taken into account before the DPD was published and the Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. The views of the general public has also been considered and taken into account. Alternative sites have been rigorously appraised in a consistent and transparent manner using a consistent Sustainability Appraisal Framework. 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	There is a lack of evidence to support the deliverability of sites, loss of employment sites, type of housing needed, amount of affordable housing to be delivered and viability of. The SADPD fails to allocate sufficient housing land. The Core Strategy housing target is not based on robust NPPF compliant evidence base, the actual figure is closer to 590 dpa.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by robust evidence, including, the Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal Report, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Transport Assessment and other evidence base listed in Appendix 1 of the DPD. In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate the input of key stakeholders such as the County Council, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have been taken into account before the DPD was published and the Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. The views of the general public has also been considered and taken into account. Alternative sites have been rigorously appraised in a consistent and transparent manner using a consistent Sustainability Appraisal Framework. 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Summary. The Site is available for development now; it is in single ownership of MGH and can be delivered independently of any other sites; there are no overriding technical constraints in relation to landscape, highways, ecology or flooding to prevent the site coming forward for housing; the Council has confirmed the suitability of the site for housing through the 2011 and 2014 SHLAA, the Green Belt Review by PBA and the draft SADPD.	None stated.	The support for the site is noted. However please note the above response with regards to timeframes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Summary. The Site is available for development now; it is in single ownership of MGH and can be delivered independently of any other sites; there are no overriding technical constraints in relation to landscape, highways, ecology or flooding to prevent the site coming forward for housing; the Council has confirmed the suitability of the site for housing through the 2011 and 2014 SHLAA, the Green Belt Review by PBA and the draft SADPD.	None stated.	The support for the site is noted. However please note the above response with regards to timeframes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The site is sustainably located. There is a footpath between the site and Mayford centre. At its nearest point the site is within 500m of Mayford centre, therefore it is within acceptable walking distance to key services. Existing routes could be enhanced as part of the site development. Opportunities for sustainable travel will be incorporated as part of a site Masterplan. Worplesden Station, a key feature for sustainable travel, is located 2.3km of the site. Cycling routes to the station will be reviewed and improved. [Context and facilities plan supplied]	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The site is sustainably located. There is a footpath between the site and Mayford centre. At its nearest point the site is within 500m of Mayford centre, therefore t is within acceptable walking distance to key services. Existing routes could be enhances as part of the site development. Opportunities for sustainable travel will be incorporated as part of a site Masterplan. Worplesden Station, a key feature for sustainable travel, is located 2.3km of the site. Cycling routes to the station will be reviewed and improved. [Context and facilities plan supplied]	None stated.	The additional supporting information is noted. The information will help at later stages in bringing the sites forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The Borough's housing target should be higher to reflect up-to-date housing needs. 500 dwelling are allocated on urban sites that have been described in the 2014 SHLAA as being constrained and therefore not deliverable or developable during the plan period. For example one site is an active aggregates yard and others active office use. The Sustainability Appraisal for the SADPD acknowledges there are limitations to an urban first approach.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.9. Please also refer to the Council's response to earlier comments	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The Borough's housing target should be higher to reflect up-to-date housing needs. 500 dwelling are allocated on urban sites that have been described in the 2014 SHLAA as being constrained and therefore not deliverable or developable during the plan period. For example one site is an active aggregates yard and others active office use. The Sustainability Appraisal for the SADPD acknowledges there are limitations to an urban first approach.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.9. Please also refer to the Council's response to earlier comments	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The housing target is too low therefore the plan is not positively prepared as it fails to meet the Borough's housing needs. The SADPD fails the four tests of soundness.	None stated.	<p>The Council has prepared an Issues and Matters Topic Paper that addresses all the above issues in detail, and should read in conjunction with this response.</p> <p>The Woking Core Strategy was adopted in October 2012. Its provisions, in particular, the housing requirement was assessed against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and found sound. The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 (not 630 as suggested by the representation) is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.</p> <p>The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The housing target is too low therefore the plan is not positively prepared as it fails to meet the Borough's housing needs. The SADPD fails the four tests of soundness.	None stated.	<p>The Council has prepared an Issues and Matters Topic Paper that addresses all the above issues in detail, and should read in conjunction with this response.</p> <p>The Woking Core Strategy was adopted in October 2012. Its provisions, in particular, the housing requirement was assessed against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and found sound. The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 (not 630 as suggested by the representation) is not significantly different from 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>options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.</p> <p>The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met.</p>	
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The SA DPD is not consistent with national policy or planning practice guidance as it has not identified or responded to the objectively assessed Borough housing need.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The SA DPD is not consistent with national policy or planning practice guidance as it has not identified or responded to the objectively assessed Borough housing need.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The is not effective as it will not deliver enough new homes over the plan period. The SADPD is not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.	None stated.	<p>A Duty to Cooperate statement and a Consultation Statement will be published in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate in detail how the Council has engaged with local residents, adjoining authorities and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD.</p> <p>This has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See paragraph 1.5, 1.13, Section 6.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The is not effective as it will not deliver enough new homes over the plan period. The SADPD is not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.	None stated.	<p>A Duty to Cooperate statement and a Consultation Statement will be published in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate in detail how the Council has engaged with local residents, adjoining authorities and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD.</p> <p>This has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See paragraph 1.5, 1.13, Section 6.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	The SADPD is not justified as it is not based on an up-to-date SHMA, in conflict with Paragraph 158 of the NPPF.	None stated.	The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	The SADPD is not justified as it is not based on an up-to-date SHMA, in conflict with Paragraph 158 of the NPPF.	None stated.	The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Any future planning application will be supported by a Transport Assessment. Aside from this, iTransport have already begun assessing the highway network impact of the site.	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, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Any future planning application will be supported by a Transport Assessment. Aside from this, iTransport have already begun assessing the highway network impact of the site.	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, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB10	Questions the viability of sites and whether they will be able to be brought forward for housing.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by robust evidence, including, the Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal Report, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Transport Assessment and other evidence base listed in Appendix 1 of the DPD. In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate the input of key stakeholders such as the County Council, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have been taken into account before the DPD was published and the Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. The views of the general public has also been considered and taken into account. Alternative sites have been rigorously appraised in a consistent and transparent manner using a consistent Sustainability Appraisal Framework. 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
1065	Andrew	Johnston	GB11	Questions the viability of sites and whether they will be able to be brought forward for housing.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by robust evidence, including, the Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal Report, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Transport Assessment and other evidence base listed in Appendix 1 of the DPD. In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate the input of key stakeholders such as the County Council, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have been taken into account before the DPD was published and the Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. The views of the general public has also been considered and taken into account. Alternative sites have been rigorously appraised in a consistent and transparent manner using a consistent Sustainability Appraisal Framework. 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
425	Lindsey	Johnstone	GB4	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional. Consider other areas where there is better 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	No further modification is 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>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.</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>	
425	Lindsey	Johnstone	GB5	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional. Consider other areas where there is better infrastructure.	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).</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
425	Lindsey	Johnstone	GB4	Object to the release of GB in Byfleet. The roads are busy and become gridlocked when incidents occur on the M25 and A3. The additional housing will exacerbate problems further.	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 comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
425	Lindsey	Johnstone	GB5	Object to the release of GB in Byfleet. The roads are busy and become gridlocked when incidents occur on the M25 and A3. The additional housing will exacerbate problems further.	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 comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	The proposal is contrary to the Government's purpose of the Green Belt: To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas	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. All the sites have been assessed against their impact. It is not envisaged that the proposals with compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This judgment is informed by the assessment of the lancape implications of the proposals. Details is this is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	There is a large amount of development, of 1160+ new homes, expected in Pyrford (Lovelace Drive and Aviary Road sites), alongside neighbouring areas. This will have extra infrastructure costs, which the Council needs to consider and ensure infrastructure delivery.	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 Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations can be developed without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	Traffic is rapidly increasing, with limited routes available to cross the M25. Development will worsen already unacceptable traffic conditions in the area.	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
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	Concerned that the proposals would lead to Pyrford being 'swallowed up' into increasing urban sprawl, and with the village no longer being what the respondent knows.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. It is not expected that the proposals will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	The Green Belt is important to Pyrford residents, and the Council should not ignore or overrule this. States that the proposals would blight the lives of residents, in order to satisfy government Green Belt building statistics.	None stated.	The concerns expressed by residents of Pyrford have not been ignored. However, the Council has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. This is evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
96	Robert	Jones	GB12	Local people voted Councillors and MPs in at the election and they expect them to start fighting for the people and village of Pyrford.	None stated.	The development needs of the area are already agreed in the Core Strategy which went through extensive public consultation before it was adopted. The Site Allocations only identifies sites to meet the developments needs and in so doing making sure of the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. This is also a requirement of government.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	The proposal is contrary to the Government's purpose of the Green Belt: To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas	None stated.	The proposals have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. It is not envisaged that they would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	There is a large amount of development, of 1160+ new homes, expected in Pyrford (Lovelace Drive and Aviary Road sites), alongside neighbouring areas. This will have extra infrastructure costs, which the Council needs to consider and ensure infrastructure delivery.	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
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	Traffic is rapidly increasing, with limited routes available to cross the M25. Development will worsen already unacceptable traffic conditions in the area.	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
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	Concerned that the proposals would lead to Pyrford being 'swallowed up' into increasing urban sprawl, and with the village no longer being what the respondent knows.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						not 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.	
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	The Green Belt is important to Pyrford residents, and the Council should not ignore or overrule this. States that the proposals would blight the lives of residents, in order to satisfy government Green Belt building statistics.	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
96	Robert	Jones	GB13	Local people voted Councillors and MPs in at the election and they expect them to start fighting for the people and village of Pyrford.	None stated.	The development needs of the area are already agreed in the Core Strategy which went through extensive public consultation before it was adopted. The Site Allocations only identifies sites to meet the developments needs and in so doing making sure of the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. This is also a requirement of government.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.			
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		development of the site is sustainable.	
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</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
343	Mark	Jones	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.	<p>The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the 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.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the area.	
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.			
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
343	Mark	Jones	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
343	Mark	Jones	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
343	Mark	Jones	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</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</p>	No further modification is 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>	
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommend a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be	No further modification is 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>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>	
343	Mark	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB9	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				would maintain openness of the area		and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	GB10	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
343	Mark	Jones	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council 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>	
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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	Do not include this site in the DPD.	<p>In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the</p>	No further modification is 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 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.		Plan led process.	
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
343	Mark	Jones	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
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				due to removal of the escarpment.		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.	
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development.			of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the	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	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
				validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.		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
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site	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
				as a Traveller site.			
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	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
472	Angela	Jones	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
472	Angela	Jones	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
472	Angela	Jones	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
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a	The site should be removed from	In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	the DPD for the reasons stated.		
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.</p> <p>This representation regarding flooding has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				an 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.	
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	stated.	remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
472	Angela	Jones	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
498	Anne	Jones	GB12	Strongly objects to a potential 400+ houses in the east of the Borough, blighting the current Green Belt and endangering heritage views from the Escarpment to the North Downs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
498	Anne	Jones	GB13	Strongly objects to a potential 400+ houses in the east of the Borough, blighting the current Green Belt and endangering heritage views from the Escarpment to the North Downs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
498	Anne	Jones	GB12	Traffic, parking and local amenities are already stretched to the limit, and this proposal would be the breaking point.	None stated.	This representation 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
498	Anne	Jones	GB13	Traffic, parking and local amenities are already stretched to the limit, and this proposal would be the breaking point.	None stated.	This representation 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
665	Gary	Jones	GB5	The A245 is already congested and additional housing will make it worse	Making the tunnel under the train line at Byfleet/New Haw station would help alleviate some of the congestion.	<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 note the proposed modification to expand the existing tunnel under Byfleet and New Haw railway station. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
665	Gary	Jones	GB5	The site is in flood plain so not a good location for housing. The environment agency should consider the site before housing can be considered.	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
933	Fiona	Jones	General	<p>Request the Inspector formally assesses the site (SITE/0064/KNAP SHLAAKN052: Land off Carhouse Lane, Knaphill, GU21 4XS) for inclusion in the SA DPD as an appropriate site for residential houses.</p> <p>Do not agree development of the site would result in isolated development within the Green Belt and have a significant impact on character.</p> <p>The site has two access points. The site is located within walking distance of Knaphill amenities and local school; adjacent to existing housing; close to public and sustainable transport links, and; close to recreation areas.</p> <p>Development will create/improve public open space for recreation use.</p>	Amendment to the Green Belt boundary to include the site for housing	<p>The site has already been assessed against other potential sites in the Sustainability Appraisal. The assessment of the site found that the majority of the site to be in Flood Zone 2 and was assessed poorly in relation to its accessibility to services and facilities.</p> <p>The GBBR also assessed the general area in which the site is located and found that the area had 'low suitability for removal from the Green Belt'.</p> <p>The site was not taken forward for these combined reasons.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Developer will comply with SU and Flood Risk Assessment. Land has remained fallow and unlikely to be used for agriculture uses. Nursery is manmade, not natural woodland. There are a number of derelict buildings on the site.			
1117	Susan	Jones	GB12	I object. Apart from the wanton destruction of valuable green space, roads and amenities are already overflowing and quality of life will be adversely affected.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. 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
1117	Susan	Jones	GB13	I object. Apart from the wanton destruction of valuable green space, roads and amenities are already overflowing and quality of life will be adversely affected.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. 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
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB13	These fields are Green Belt, it is perverse to construct 400 homes on them. Pyrford has no open public space for community activities. The little existing green land should remain so. Development would inflict great harm to this community and the concept of Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 3, 7 and 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB12	These fiel are Green Belt, it is perverse to construct 400 homes on them. Pyrford has no open public space for community activities. The little existing green land should remain so. Development would inflict great harm to this community and the concept of Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB13	Pyrford is a village. The proposals will turn it into a soulless dormitory town with environmental problems, notably more traffic, lack of school places, dental and medical facilities.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB12	Pyrford is a village. The proposals will turn it into a soulless dormitory town with environmental problems, notably more traffic, lack of school places, dental and medical facilities.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 3, 23 and 19. The Council is satisfied the proposals in Pyrford will not significantly undermine its character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB13	Development of a new school is unnecessary. Its industrial/Tesco type construction is out of keeping in this designated heritage area and it implies it is intended to accommodate more children, presumably from development proposed at Upshot Lane.	None stated.	The need for a secondary school has been justified in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Site GB8 has been identified to meet the education needs of the area. Education provision being delivered thorough the planning application process other than this site is a separate process that can be best addressed by the Development Management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB12	Development of a new school is unnecessary. Its industrial/Tesco type construction is out of keeping in this designated heritage area and it implies it is intended to accommodate more children, presumably from development proposed at Upshot Lane.	None stated.	The need for a secondary school has been justified in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The site GB8 has been identified to meet the education needs of the area. Education provision being delivered thorough the planning application process other than this site is a separate process that can be best addressed by the Development Management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB13	The impacts on residents have not been thought through. The recent development of the former Oakcroft private school could have provided small homes for people like myself who wish to stay in Pyrford, freeing our larger family homes for those who may now be the target for the Upshot Lane 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. In addition to development that has taken place and those likely to come forward in the urban area, there will still be the need to identify Green Belt land to meet future development needs. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out to ensure that the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposals are taken into account and any adverse impacts minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB12	The impacts on residents have not been thought through. The recent development of the former Oakcroft private school could have provided small homes for people like myself who wish to stay in Pyrford, freeing our larger family homes for those who may now be the target for the Upshot Lane 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. In addition to development that has recently been taken place and those that will come forward in the urban area, there will still be the need to identify Green Belt land to meet development requirements. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out to ensure that the environmental, social and economic implications of the proposals are taken into account and any adverse impacts minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB12	Development will increase traffic on an already busy road and will place further pressure on school places.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1133	Eunice	Jones	GB13	Development will increase traffic on an already busy road and will place further pressure on school places.	None stated.	This representation has comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	<p>The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the 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.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	<p>Concur with the collective views of SHHRA.</p> <p>Was a joint of author of the Department for Transport's Guidance on Transport Assessment and is surprised that the local planning and highways authorities have paid so little regard to the potential transport impacts of the proposal. At the very least, a Transport Statement to identify the existing problems should have been identified.</p> <p>Although the scale of the proposal may not contribute significantly to the local traffic volume, the nature of the business may mean long/heavy vehicles manoeuvring. This should be assessed.</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, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5</p> <p>The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5</p> <p>The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5</p> <p>The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				exclude development.		<p>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>	
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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. 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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. 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				ONLY sites put forward.			
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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 the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition, the 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>Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5</p>	
1256	Andrew	Jones	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>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>Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will 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>	
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <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
1256	Andrew	Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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>This representation 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				additional traffic.		<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>	
1256	Andrew	Jones	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>This representation 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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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.	<p>In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1256	Andrew	Jones	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1256	Andrew	Jones	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
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB4	Byfleet does not have much Green Belt left, and if these areas are used there will be none left.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB5	Byfleet does not have much Green Belt left, and if these areas are used there will be none left.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB4	Objects to the proposal. Current infrastructure is inadequate and building new homes will worsen this.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is	No further modification is 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 case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB5	Objects to the proposal. Current infrastructure is inadequate and building new homes will worsen this.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB4	Roads are already gridlocked and more cars would cause extra disruption.	None stated.	This representation 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
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB5	Roads are already gridlocked and more cars would cause extra disruption.	None stated.	This representation 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
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB4	The land proposed has recently been flooded or is identified as at risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1441	Debbie	Jones	GB5	The land proposed has recently been flooded or is identified as at risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	Antisocial behaviour ten to be more pronounced in overcrowded areas. It is evident that police resources are inadequate to deal to small increases in criminal activity. Although I'd prefer the scheme to be rationalised and provide a mix of housing, I'd also like to know that adequate resources will be available to the police and other social services to cope with the increased population.	None stated.	It is not expected that the need for additional police resources for this level of population increase would be significant. However, the police, like other service providers, are kept informed and consulted on this plan. They are part of both the Surrey Strategic Partnership and Woking Partnership. The approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	Understands that residents at the development will rely on surrounding facilities (doctors, shops, parks etc). Appreciates that housing needs to be built somewhere but when it is in such a proximate location and at such a scale, the quality of life for existing residents must be maintained by proposals to mitigate impacts of the development.	Introduce more on site recreational facilities and other amenities. Ensure improvements in local public utilities, services and infrastructure can cope with the increased demand.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. On doctors surgeries, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Potential for additional shopping facilities are included in the proposed allocations in West Byfleet District Centre (sites UA50 and UA51) and also, in the wider area, in Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB16	Aware of a major study of traffic flows in the area is planned but previous, well intentioned measures such as installation of chicanes in Scotland Bridge Road have not improved road safety. Economising today often lea to extra expense in the future. Please find solutions that will stand the test of time.	Seek solutions to the issues surrounding Sheer House and the traffic congestion through the town centre before they are compounded by the new development. These solution	This representation 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 seek to ensure that delivery of transport improvements or mitigation is sustainable in the long term, but also viable with regard to the nature and scale of development 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
					should withstand the test of time.		
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	Concerned about the proposal due to its scale and consequent impact on surrounding services. If the access to the site is from the current entrance on Parvis Road is will increase traffic on an already overcrowded road.	Find way to minimise the traffic effect on Parvis Road	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 on the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision, and in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 on traffic.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	There is a urgent need to address and improve West Byfleet town centre, including Sheer House, shops and parking. This development should not be delayed until after residential development is underway, as it will not be as effective. Fun should be found to improve West Byfleet as have been invested in Woking Town Centre recently.	None stated.	Comment noted. Sites in West Byfleet District Centre are allocated as part of this draft DPD, references UA50, UA51 and UA52, and include Sheer House. Detail of the delivery arrangements for these sites are included in the draft allocations. The role of West Byfleet as a District Centre is highlighted in the Core Strategy, which alongside this document promotes development and investment in the centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	UA50	There is a urgent need to address and improve West Byfleet town centre, including Sheer House, shops and parking. This development should not be delayed until after residential development is underway, as it will not be as effective. Fun should be found to improve West Byfleet as have been invested in Woking Town Centre recently.	None stated.	Comment noted. Sites in West Byfleet District Centre are allocated as part of this draft DPD, references UA50, UA51 and UA52, and include Sheer House. Detail of the delivery arrangements for these sites are included in the draft allocations. The role of West Byfleet as a District Centre is highlighted in the Core Strategy, which alongside this document promotes development and investment in the centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	UA51	There is a urgent need to address and improve West Byfleet town centre, including Sheer House, shops and parking. This development should not be delayed until after residential development is underway, as it will not be as effective. Fun should be found to improve West Byfleet as have been invested in Woking Town Centre recently.	None stated.	Comment noted. Sites in West Byfleet District Centre are allocated as part of this draft DPD, references UA50, UA51 and UA52, and include Sheer House. Detail of the delivery arrangements for these sites are included in the draft allocations. The role of West Byfleet as a District Centre is highlighted in the Core Strategy, which alongside this document promotes development and investment in the centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	The current bias toward the affordable nature of the development is inappropriate to West Byfleet and should be structured to be more in line with the locale. A more balanced mix of properties would help diminish distinctions and divisions, which could be created by focusing heavily on the lower end of the housing ladder. The same thoughts apply to Traveller provisions currently included.	Rationalise the number of houses and improve the mix of affordable/aspirational housing. Reconsider the appropriateness of the Traveller provision.	The proposed development seeks an appropriate mix of housing, which includes affordable housing, in this case 50% to be provided on site. This is aimed at promoting a mixed and balanced community and providing housing to meet local housing need. This is in line with the Council's Core Strategy (2012) Policies CS11: Housing Mix and CS12: Affordable Housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB15	The road where I live runs immediately parallel to Parvis Road, is mainly unadopted and has no highway rights. When there is traffic of Parvis Road drivers detour down our road at dangerously high speeds. Currently in discussions with County Council officials to establish measures to discourage this practice, but any increase in vehicles needing to access West Hall will significantly worsen the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Transport Assessment, which assesses the transport and traffic implications of proposed development, takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. The enforcement issues, and particularly speeding, are not local planning issues and are not expected to be worsened by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1495	Peter	Jones	GB16	The road where I live runs immediately parallel to Parvis Road, is mainly unadopted and has no highway rights. When there is traffic of Parvis Road drivers detour down our road at dangerously high speeds. Currently in discussions with County Council officials to establish measures to discourage this practice, but wanted to give some context about the already heavily congested main road. The current proposal includes a 'Terrapin Crossing' to facilitate pedestrians, but would halt traffic and cause further congestion. Suggests either a pedestrian bridge or underpass which although more expensive would address the issues for both pedestrians and drivers.	Build a pedestrian bridge or underpass over/under Parvis Road to access the site from the railway side of the road.	This representation 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 Transport Assessment, which assesses the transport and traffic implications of proposed development, takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. The enforcement issues, and particularly speeding, are not local planning issues and are not expected to be worsened 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
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB12	Has serious concerns about the increase in traffic and associated safety issues on local roads caused by the proposed development. There has been a recent significant increase in traffic (ignoring the speed limit) down Oakcroft Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Transport Assessment, which assesses the transport and traffic implications of proposed development, takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. The enforcement issues, and particularly speeding, are not local planning issues and are not expected to be worsened by the proposed allocations. Any issues should be raised with the County Council and/or the police.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB13	Has serious concerns about the increase in traffic and associated safety issues on local roads caused by the proposed development. There has been a recent significant increase in traffic (ignoring the speed limit) down Oakcroft Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Transport Assessment, which assesses the transport and traffic implications of proposed development, takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. The enforcement issues, and particularly speeding, are not local planning issues and are not expected to be worsened by the proposed allocations. Any issues should be raised with the County Council and/or the police.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB12	Conversion of the old private school on Coldharbour Lane to flats, on which we were not consulted despite it being just a few hundred metres away, will further exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This consultation relates specifically to the proposed site allocations, and not to previous planning permissions. These would have been dealt with and considered with regard to their transport implications, and appropriate mitigation, before their permission was granted. Traffic and transport infrastructure for the proposed allocations is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB13	Conversion of the old private school on Coldharbour Lane to flats, on which we were not consulted despite it being just a few hundred metres away, will further exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This consultation relates specifically to the proposed site allocations, and not to previous planning permissions. These would have been dealt with and considered with regard to their transport implications, and appropriate mitigation, before their permission was granted. Traffic and transport infrastructure for the proposed allocations is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB12	Values and is proud of the natural beauty and views along the side of the field on Upshot Lane down to the Wey Navigation. This would be impaired by the development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. Regarding recreation use and opportunities for walking in the area, the key requirements for the site state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. The key requirements also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB13	Values and is proud of the natural beauty and views along the side of the field on Upshot Lane down to the Wey Navigation. This would be impaired by the development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0. Regarding recreation use and opportunities for walking in the area, the key requirements for the site state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. The key requirements also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB12	Objects to the proposals. Moved to the area to escape the rat-race and live in a beautiful and relaxing part of the Surrey Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and character issues raised are covered in Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper. Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. 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
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB13	Objects to the proposals. Moved to the area to escape the rat-race and live in a beautiful and relaxing part of the Surrey Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and character issues raised are covered in Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper. Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. 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
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB12	Leaves it to the experts to comment as we do not know enough about the technicalities, but the Council must be seen to apply their own rules consistently for all proposed development and should not be influenced by new building targets from central government. Urges the Council to seriously consider local residents' views and reject this damaging proposal.	None stated.	Comment noted. It is considered that the introduction of the draft DPD gives background to this representation. Further detail can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, specifically Sections 1.0, 2.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1499	A.J. , L. Sivalogan athan-Jones	Jones	GB13	Leaves it to the experts to comment as we do not know enough about the technicalities, but the Council must be seen to apply their own rules consistently for all proposed development and should not be influenced by new building targets from central government. Urges the Council to seriously consider local residents' views and reject this damaging proposal.	None stated.	Comment noted. It is considered that the introduction of the draft DPD gives background to this representation. Further detail can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, specifically Sections 1.0, 2.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1440	Don	Josey	GB15	Representing the Surrey Gardens Trust, notes the key requirements on retention of large areas of woodland and parkland setting, creation of a strong lancape edge and protection of the setting of listed and locally listed buildings - essential in relation to the surviving designed lancape interest at the West Hall Estate. If achieved further loss of interest will be substantially mitigated. Recent developments around the site have significantly changed the character of the former ground and gardens.	None stated.	Comment welcomed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1440	Don	Josey	GB22	Supports the proposal for Heritage Parkland/ Country Park. Interested in the possibility of archaeological work to reveal garden/ lancape features. The various studies envisaged should help with this.	None stated.	Support welcomed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1440	Don	Josey	GB16	Representing the Surrey Gardens Trust, notes the key requirements on the setting of the listed buildings, retention of trees and avoidance of development of the site frontage. The setting of the buildings is tied up with their garden setting and features from c.1900. garden design interest of Broadoaks is noted in the Surrey Historic Environment Record and would thus need to be considered as a nondesignated heritage asset. The key requirements seem likely to ensure an assessment of significance would take place.	None stated.	Comment noted. As stated, the Key Requirements list includes the need to retain and enhance the setting of the Grade II listed buildings, retain trees (Tree Preservation Order). The relevant guidance on heritage, with regard to the Council's Core Strategy, Design SPD and wider, including English Heritage guidance would also be taken into account in any development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1035	Jacqui	Joyce	UA32	Unnecessary to redevelop the whole area highlighted, the Council is taking more than required. Can only understand the centre part where the flats and shops are.	None stated.	Sheerwater has been identified in the Core Strategy as a Priority Place for targeted action. The proposed allocation and the key requirements it seeks to achieve will lead to significant improvements in the area. Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy sets out clear objectives for the regeneration of the area, with an explanation of the underlying issues that needs to be addressed in the area. Many of the issues are reflected in the key requirements of the proposal. Detailed matters such as the nature and type of housing, design, land acquisition will be addressed at part of the development management process. It is noted that in parallel with the plan making process, there is also a planning application on the site that is being determined. The Local Planning Authority has to make sure that the application is determined in accordance with Policy CS5 and other relevant policies of the Local Plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1035	Jacqui	Joyce	UA32	Consultation not well advertised.	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
1035	Jacqui	Joyce	UA32	Map unclear, unable to see details. If the proposals include the section of Albert Drive past the roundabout towards West Byfleet this area is not deprived and would just be an attempt at a land grab.	None stated.	The proposed allocation for UA32 does not extend past the round about on Albert Drive. The proposed site boundary is consistent with the current planning application for the site which is currently being determined by the Local Planning Authority. Nevertheless a map of all of the sites within draft Site Allocations DPD was available on the Council's website, at the Borough's Libraries as well as at Civic Offices during the consultation period. A map will also be available during the future Regulation 19 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
77	Ray	Jupp	GB12	Detrimental impact on the character of the village	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 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 proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
77	Ray	Jupp	GB13	Detrimental impact on the character of the village	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	
77	Ray	Jupp	GB12	Impact on the local road network would be significant.	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
77	Ray	Jupp	GB13	Impact on the local road network would be significant.	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