

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	Site contains bridle paths and public rights of way.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site in the Site Allocations DPD sets out that Public Rights of Way must be safeguarded and existing footpaths should be retained. This would be considered in further detail at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the Council believe that the wording of the key requirements in the DPD will ensure that the existing footpaths and rights of way are protected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB10	Disregards with CS24 objective to conserve escarpments and heathlands.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	Disregards with CS24 objective to conserve escarpments and heathlands.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB14	Reclassification does not satisfy exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	As noted within the draft Site Allocations DPD reasoned justification, the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt in assist in ensuring a strong defensible Green Belt boundary in the future. The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. If sites GB8 (Nursery Land adjacent to Egley Road) and GB10 (Land to the north east of Saunders Lane) are removed from the Green Belt post-2027, site GB14 will be surrounded by land designated as urban area. This isolated pocket of Green Belt land would therefore not create a strong defensible Green Belt boundary in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB10	The road floods routinely in winter. Water runs the hill from GB14 until it was blocked by the rail line. Development west of the rail line will increase run-off and make the road more dangerous.	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
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	The road floods routinely in winter. Water runs the hill from GB14 until it was blocked by the rail line. Development west of the rail line will increase run-off and make the road more dangerous.	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
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB14	The road floods routinely in winter. Water runs the hill from GB14 until it was blocked by the rail line. Development west of the rail line will increase run-off and make the road more dangerous.	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
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB14	Unclear about intentions for the site. Sole entry to the site is accessed from Hook Hill Lane. This is a narrow and busy road, with single track rail bridge restriction therefore the area unsuitable for general public access.	None stated.	As noted in the Site Allocations DPD key requirements, when the site comes forward for green infrastructure purposes the provision of improved accessibility will be required. This includes pedestrian and cycle links. This level of detail would be considered at the Development Management stage, where matters such as access and any impacts on the highways network will be considered by both the Local Planning Authority and the County Highways Authority.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB10	Local infrastructure cannot support such as large population increase. There is only a post office and barbers.	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
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	Local infrastructure cannot support such as large population increase. There is only a post office and barbers.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB10	Proposed density is higher than surrounding areas, in conflict with the Council's Core Strategy policy CS24 object to conserve and where possible enhance character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	Proposed density is higher than surrounding areas, in conflict with the Council's Core Strategy policy CS24 object to conserve and where possible enhance character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB10	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The area is used by drivers as rat-runs to the three rail crossings.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and safety to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB11	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The area is used by drivers as rat-runs to the three rail crossings. Hook Hill Lane is dangerous for pedestrian and cyclists, people have to walk in the road with blind corners and narrow width. Will become a rat-run because of its directness to the site. Recent roadworks on Triggs Lane caused gridlock. Rail crossings need to been improved as the area is saturated.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and safety to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1014	Simon Susie	Lacey	GB14	<p>The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The area is used by drivers as rat-runs to the three rail crossings. Hook Hill Lane is dangerous for pedestrian and cyclists, people have to walk in the road with blind corners and narrow width. Will become a rat-run because of its directness to the site.</p> <p>Recent roadworks on Triggs Lane caused gridlock. Rail crossings need to been improved as the area is saturated.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and safety to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Concerned about the impact on wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Concerned about the impact on wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Concerned about the increase in traffic, when roads into West Byfleet are already very congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Concerned about the increase in traffic, when roads into West Byfleet are already very congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Concerned about the extra load on already oversubscribed health centres and schools.	None stated.	The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a 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
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Concerned about the extra load on already oversubscribed health centres and schools.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The representation is also addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Concerned that giving up the Green Belt, which we thought was protected from mass urbanisation, will lead to the destruction of trees, footpaths and irreversibly spoil the rural setting and charming landscape of Pyrford. This should be preserved. Pyrford is an asset to the Borough.	The natural landscape should be preserved.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Concerned that giving up the Green Belt, which we thought was protected from mass urbanisation, will lead to the destruction of trees, footpaths and irreversibly spoil the rural setting and charming landscape of Pyrford. This should be preserved. Pyrford is an asset to the Borough.	The natural landscape should be preserved.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB3	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	While retirement homes, and more widely homes for older people are needed in the Borough, they are planned for in other allocations in this plan (specifically sites GB4 and GB16) and are also not precluded by the residential allocations of other sites. Homes for older people can be planned for as part of a wider mix of housing, as promoted and encouraged by Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS13. The Council has a duty to meet identified need for traveller pitches, and this site is considered suitable to meet this need in comparison to reasonable alternatives sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB1	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB2	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB4	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB5	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB7	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. 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. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB8	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. 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. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB9	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. 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. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB10	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. 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. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB11	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. 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. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted, and while it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part 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
						a suitable mix of development.	
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted, and while it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB14	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted, and while it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB15	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB16	Objects to development of housing and traveller sites across Woking by releasing Green Belt. Moved to Pyrford and loves the village feel and rural setting. While understanding the need for change and for new houses, shouldn't these be aimed at the elderly who currently face a shortage of retirement homes?	None stated.	This comment is noted. The character of the areas where development is proposed will be protected through the key requirements of development, and Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's Landscape and Townscape. While it is agreed that there is need for housing for elderly people, there is also much wider housing need, for affordable and market homes. This is outlined in more detail in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet (site GB16) specifically includes housing to meet the needs of the elderly, and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS13 supports development of accommodation for older people in suitable locations. West Byfleet may be considered a suitable location for such development, with its proximity to a range of shops and services in West Byfleet District Centre. However, all sites for residential development would be considered with regard to Policy CS13 and also Policy CS11, which encourages a suitable mix of dwellings to address local need, and homes for older people may be encouraged as part of a suitable mix of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB12	Hopes we will take on board the feedback and consider the feelings of Pyrford residents.	None stated.	All representations and feedback to this consultation will be given due consideration with regard to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the relevant planning regulations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1401	Louis, Jalpa	Lai	GB13	Hopes we will take on board the feedback and consider the feelings of Pyrford residents.	None stated.	All representations and feedback to this consultation will be given due consideration with regard to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the relevant planning regulations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
964	Jonathan	Lambert	GB12	Concerned the Council have gone against advice from independent GBR.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
964	Jonathan	Lambert	GB13	Concerned the Council have gone against advice from independent GBR.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
964	Jonathan	Lambert	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Existing plans in Guildford borough and Byfleet will have	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>significant impacts on congestion, safety and infrastructure in Pyrford.</p> <p>The trains are overcrowded and additional residents will make this worse.</p> <p>The distance of the development sites will lead to residents driving to the station. The station car park is already full therefore infrastructure investment would be required.</p> <p>The road network is already congested and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Traffic from the development sites will pass outside the Pyrford school. A school child was hit by a car earlier this year.</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>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p>	of this representation
964	Jonathan	Lambert	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford.</p> <p>Existing plans in Guildford borough and Byfleet will have significant impacts on congestion, safety and infrastructure in Pyrford.</p> <p>The trains are overcrowded and additional residents will make this worse.</p> <p>The distance of the development sites will lead to residents driving to the station. The station car park is already full therefore infrastructure investment would be required.</p> <p>The road network is already congested and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Traffic from the development sites will pass outside the Pyrford school. A school child was hit by a car earlier this year.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB12	<p>Deep concern of the proposed development areas Pyrford Lovelace Drive and Upshot Lane.</p> <p>Moved back due to the peaceful setting with amazing school and close links to London and local amenities to hand in a small village community. Compared to Weybridge where traffic and congestion is far worse and regularly affected by the M25, what used to be a peaceful town is now struggling with schools and the NHS being strained. Pyrford is a small caring community with many local clubs and has direct access to the countryside within a 5 minute walk. The outstanding school is already heavily oversubscribed. Chose this area around Woking because of the green space and direct countryside access and being able to breathe clean air and go for walks in the countryside without using the car is very important.</p>	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB12	<p>Terrified the Council will make a mistake and regret the consequences. Aware of Government requirements for providing housing and the choices that have to be made with planning. But the housing proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to the local community which would not be resolved with such a small community.</p> <p>The roads are used as cut through to Ripley and Woking. Putting 423 new houses into an area where single track roads are a common will result in residents not being able to use the roads and confined to their homes.</p>	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet the development needs of the area and the proposals will make a contribution towards that and also ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council acknowledge that Pyrford has a distinctive character and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the 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 purpose and integrity of the Green Belt will be undermined by the proposals. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB12	423 new houses will mean: 800+ cars, 1000's of children and Pyrford School is already at breaking point.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB12	How will homes be made affordable? House prices in Pyrford are already unattainable for the average family. Will builders be forced to keep their prices low? The Help to Buy option won't help people to buy in an area that has seen considerable price increases in the past 9 years.	None stated.	The Council has an affordable housing policy, Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy to make sure that a proportion of housing development is affordable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB12	There are many things wrong with the proposals. Shame on the landowner who will benefit from selling this land and inflict unnecessary misery on many families that have	Reconsider these plans.	Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				supported the Conservatives. Please reconsider these plans.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2.	
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB13	Deep concern of the proposed development areas Pyrford Lovelace Drive and Upshot Lane. Moved back due to the peaceful setting with amazing school and close links to London and local amenities to hand in a small village community. Compared to Weybridge where traffic and congestion is far worse and regularly affected by the M25, what used to be a peaceful town is now struggling with schools and the NHS being strained. Pyrford is a small caring community with many local clubs and has direct access to the countryside within a 5 minute walk. The outstanding school is already heavily oversubscribed. Chose this area around Woking because of the green space and direct countryside access and being able to breathe clean air and go for walks in the countryside without using the car is very important.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB13	Terrified the Council will make a mistake and regret the consequences. Aware of Government requirements for providing housing and the choices that have to be made with planning. But the housing proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to the local community which would not be resolved with such a small community. The roads are used a cut through to Ripley and Woking. Putting 423 new houses into an area where single track roads are a common will result in residents not being able to use the roads and confined to their homes.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB13	423 new houses will mean: 800+ cars, 1000's of children and Pyrford School is already at breaking point.	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB13	How will homes be made affordable? House prices in Pyrford are already unattainable for the average family. Will builders be forced to keep their prices low? The Help to Buy option won't help people to buy in an area that has seen considerable price increases in the past 9 years.	None stated.	The Council has an Affordable housing policy, Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy to make sure that a proportion of housing development is affordable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
52	Amy	Lambkin	GB13	There are many things wrong with the proposals. Shame on the landowner who will benefit from selling this land and inflict unnecessary misery on many families that have supported the Conservatives. Please reconsider these plans.	Reconsider these plans.	Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1263	Andrew	Land	GB10	The evidence in various reports demonstrate how inappropriate the sites are for development. There are	None stated.	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.	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
				significant constraints that would require a long list of mitigation factors.		<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.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 paragraph 1.13, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0</p>	of this representation
1263	Andrew	Land	GB11	The evidence in various reports demonstrate how inappropriate the sites are for development. There are significant constraints that would require a long list of mitigation factors.	None stated.	<p>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>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.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 paragraph 1.13, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1263	Andrew	Land	GB10	<p>The site is not suitable for high density development. Any proposal for the site will create serious traffic issues into Woking Centre.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in assessment in the GBBR for GB10 and Parcel 20. When considered alone, GB10 scores poorly. The decision to include the site was because the site is available and suitable.</p> <p>The reasons for releasing the site from the GB is not justified and is likely to attract a legal challenge. The parcel should be excluded and WBC should ensure brownfield sites have been exhausted first</p>	The parcel should be excluded. WBC should exhaust brownfield sites	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The representation regarding the evidence base has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0</p> <p>With regards to the representation on GB release, this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0</p> <p>The representation regarding the brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1263	Andrew	Land	GB11	<p>The site is not suitable for high density development. Any proposal for the site will create serious traffic issues into Woking Centre.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in assessment in the GBBR for GB10 and Parcel 20. When considered alone, GB10 scores poorly. The decision to include the site was because the site is available and suitable.</p> <p>The reasons for releasing the site from the GB is not justified and is likely to attract a legal challenge. The parcel should be excluded and WBC should ensure brownfield sites have been exhausted first</p>	The parcel should be excluded. WBC should exhaust brownfield sites	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The representation regarding the evidence base has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0</p> <p>With regards to the representation on GB release, this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0</p> <p>The representation regarding the brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
137	PA	Lane	General	Object to proposed level of housing development in Hook Heath and Mayford. Whilst exceptionally Green Belt land may be released for housing, the level proposed is far too high and will start to change the character of these areas and lead to further urban sprawl.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 1 and 2. Whilst the scale of the proposals are acknowledged, there are sufficient requirements included in the allocations to ensure that their development will not undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
137	PA	Lane	General	Road network could not cope with such population growth and its effect on transportation issues.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
137	PA	Lane	General	Such major changes should be discussed in a public consultation when housing density, supporting infrastructure and protection of the local landscape must be fully evaluated. WE MUST PROTECT THE Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council has fully engaged with the public in preparing the DPD. The Regulation 18 consultation is a demonstration of that. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6. The Council will be publishing the DPD again for Regulation 19 consultation to give the public another opportunity to comment on the DPD before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB10	<p>I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 and destruction of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Development will result in Mayford becoming a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. Development would destroy natural habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>Living here is about going for walks enjoying the countryside.</p>	Please reconsider your plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. 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 sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None 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
				National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by the Council, especially as Policy states that housing need including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.		relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites 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 sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 and destruction of the Green Belt. Development will result in Mayford becoming a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. Development would destroy natural habitats for wildlife. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by the Council, especially as Policy states that housing need including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	Please reconsider your plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. 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 sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites 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 sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB14	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 on Green Belt grounds. Building on this land will make Mayford a suburb of Woking and risk merging Woking and Guildford. Development would destroy Mayford's village status and the natural habitat of wild animals. We enjoy walking in the countryside. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances", these are not proven. Housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	Please reconsider your plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. 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 sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA	No further modification is 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>as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites 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 sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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>	
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB7	<p>I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 on Green Belt grounds. Building on this land will make Mayford a suburb of Woking and risk merging Woking and Guildford. Development would destroy Mayford's village status and the natural habitat of wild animals. We enjoy walking in the countryside. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances", these are not proven. Housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.</p>	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites 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 sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB8	<p>I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 on Green Belt grounds. Building on this land will make Mayford a suburb of Woking and risk merging Woking and Guildford. Development would destroy Mayford's village status and the natural habitat of wild animals. We enjoy walking in the countryside. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances", these are not proven. Housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.</p>	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB9	I strongly object to proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 on Green Belt grounds. Building on this land will make Mayford a suburb of Woking and risk merging Woking and Guildford. Development would destroy Mayford's village status and the natural habitat of wild animals. We enjoy walking in the countryside. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”, these are not proven. Housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	Please reconsider your plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The character of Mayford is protected by policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the overall character of the area. 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 sites can be developed for the proposed uses without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Character Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the sites on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The sites do not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the sites 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 sites minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB7	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB10	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB8	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB9	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB11	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB14	Mayford lacks the road infrastructure to support the houses proposed. The roads are narrow, busy at peak times, with speeding vehicles and some lack footpaths. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians. Mayford has limited supporting infrastructure. Worplesdon train station would be unable to cope with more commuters: there is already standing room only, the car park is extremely busy and there is now a waiting list to get a Car Park Season Ticket. The Moor Lane development will make it busier.	Please reconsider your plans.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	Flooding implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB7	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	The implication of the proposals on flooding is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB14	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans.	The implications of the proposals on flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1200	Sharon	Lane	GB7	I strongly object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
764	R	Lang	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 Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
764	R	Lang	GB8	Not totally against the redevelopment but concerned that the current proposals have not been thought through.	None stated.	<p>Support for the principle of development is noted.</p> <p>The Council has considered the impact of the proposed development of the site on the road network and local infrastructure provision. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
764	R	Lang	GB7	Object to proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
764	R	Lang	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
764	R	Lang	GB7	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
764	R	Lang	GB8	Weekend sports events and noise will impact local residents.	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
764	R	Lang	GB8	The track and stadium would generate a lot of traffic that the local roads can not cope with. It will also add to pollution. Saunders Lane can not cope with extra traffic and can not be widened. Works are carried out on local roads and accidents occur, both causing havoc.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD and Core Strategy provide a policy framework to ensure new development does not have a significant impact on air quality.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has also 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
764	R	Lang	GB8	Travelling by bus to Woking is difficult due to the frequency of services. This results in people using their cars and adding to congestion and pollution.	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
567	David	Langfield	GB12	The Council should consider a new category "Green field site until we decide otherwise".	None stated.	The Council agrees that further clarification could be made to the DPD to distinguish between the allocated sites and the safeguarded sites. This will be reflected on future presentation material and maps.	Amend Appendix 3 to highlight the safeguarded sites.
567	David	Langfield	GB13	The Council should consider a new category "Green field site until we decide otherwise".	None stated.	The Council agrees that further clarification could be made to the DPD to distinguish between the allocated sites and the safeguarded sites. This will be reflected on future presentation material and maps.	Amend Appendix 3 to highlight the safeguarded sites.
567	David	Langfield	GB12	The site is greenfield, so should be both green and a field. It will be neither of these when developers are finished with it. What is the point of designating an area as a green field site if it can be easily changed. Many people believe a green field site is exactly what it says and plan their decisions on where to live accordingly.	None stated.	<p>The Council is fully aware that the site is both greenfield and Green Belt. The definition for greenfield land can be found within the Council's Affordable Housing SPD, see Figure 2.</p> <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 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
567	David	Langfield	GB13	The site is greenfield, so should be both green and a field. It will be neither of these when developers are finished with it. What is the point of designating an area as a green field site if it can be easily changed. Many people believe a green field site is exactly what it says and plan their decisions on where to live accordingly.	None stated.	<p>The Council is fully aware that the site is both greenfield and Green Belt. The definition for greenfield land can be found within the Council's Affordable Housing SPD, see Figure 2.</p> <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 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
567	David	Langfield	GB12	Objects to the proposal to build hundreds of houses on fields in the beautiful village of Pyrford. The site is inappropriate for high density development.	None stated.	<p>The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
567	David	Langfield	GB13	Objects to the proposal to build hundreds of houses on fields in the beautiful village of Pyrford. The site is inappropriate for high density development.	None stated.	<p>The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						improvements or new green infrastructure. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	
514	Karen	Langford	GB15	Objects to the proposal due to the impact on infrastructure, particularly traffic and parking in West Byfleet. It would also impact on the health centre, which is already oversubscribed, and on trains unless more frequent services are provided.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet. With regard to train capacity, the point made is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. 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
1530	Aldo, Lynn	Lanzetta	UA28	Object to proposal as it would affect privacy at the rear of our property and reduce its future sales value.	None stated.	The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties. This includes the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design SPD and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. Through good design the proposed allocations are not expected to reduce land/or property values in the wider area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB12	The Greenbelt is a cheap and quick fix solution compared to brownfield sites but has long term implications. Continuing to develop Greenbelt will result no green spaces and fresh air for future generations.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.7-1.9, Section 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 21.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB13	The Greenbelt is a cheap and quick fix solution compared to brownfield sites but has long term implications. Continuing to develop Greenbelt will result no green spaces and fresh air for future generations.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.7-1.9, Section 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 21.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB12	Objects to development proposals on the Green Belt. Green Belt was created to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve the countryside for future generations. Views over the Pyrford Escarpment will be endangered.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and urban sprawl has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB13	Objects to development proposals on the Green Belt. Green Belt was created to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve the countryside for future generations. Views over the Pyrford Escarpment will be endangered.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and urban sprawl has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 2.0 and Section 15.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB13	Site not recommended in GBR, why have the Council gone against this advice? The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB12	Site not recommended in GBR, why have the Council gone against this advice? The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB12	Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB13	<p>Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.</p> <p>Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p>	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB12	The village of Pyrford has unspoilt countryside, historic buildings and CAs which are borough assets.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has a robust policy framework in place to ensure that heritage assets are protected from harm. This is set out in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD. This is also set out in the NPPF.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
956	Sarah	Lardner	GB13	The village of Pyrford has unspoilt countryside, historic buildings and CAs which are borough assets.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has a robust policy framework in place to ensure that heritage assets are protected from harm. This is set out in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD. This is also set out in the NPPF.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned there is no footway along railway and most of Egley Road	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	The Council sympathises with these objections however it is necessary for the Council to identify sites within the Green Belt to deliver sufficient housing in the Borough to meet the identified housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. 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
263	Peter F	Larrington	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Would change the nature of the village. Necessary road infrastructure will not be made.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Would change the nature of the village. Necessary road infrastructure will not be made.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development.</p>	
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	<p>Will turn the village into a dense urban area.</p> <p>Concerned supporting infrastructure will not be put into place.</p> <p>Will have a damaging effect on the local jobs market.</p> <p>Will negative affect the lives of current residents.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. In addition, the representation regarding infrastructure in general and funding has been addressed overall in Section 3.0.</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 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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						not be significantly undermined.	
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	Will turn the village into a dense urban area. Concerned supporting infrastructure will not be put into place. Will have a damaging effect on the local jobs market. Will negative affect the lives of current residents.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. In addition, the representation regarding infrastructure in general and funding has been addressed overall in Section 3.0.</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 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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	Large environmental effect on local wildlife. Will impact Pyrford Common.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
974	R	Lawrence	GB12	Large environmental effect on local wildlife. Will impact Pyrford Common.	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>	
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB10	Object to housing development on the sites as they will alter the character of Mayford village.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB11	Object to housing development on the sites as they will alter the character of Mayford village.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB14	Object to housing development on the sites as they will alter the character of Mayford village.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB7	Object to increasing the number of Traveller pitches on this site. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB9	Object to developing this site. This will mean no Green Belt area would be left between Woking and Mayford.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</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
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB8	Object to developing this site. This will mean no Green Belt area would be left between Woking and Mayford.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB8	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB9	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	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
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB10	Increased population is unsustainable for infrastructure which is already at capacity. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.. Houses can not be built without supporting	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.		allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB11	Increased population is unsustainable for infrastructure which is already at capacity. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB14	Increased population is unsustainable for infrastructure which is already at capacity. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB8	Proposals will increase traffic and pedestrians on narrow streets. This will lead to fatalities on the roads. Reconsider the plans as they will have a devastating impact on the residents. Mayford was mentioned in the Domesday Book and will end up becoming a gridlocked suburb.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding narrow streets and pavements will be highlighted to the County Highways Authority to see what can be done to address the current situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB9	Proposals will increase traffic and pedestrians on narrow streets. This will lead to fatalities on the roads. Reconsider	YOU MUST RECONSIDER	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the plans as they will have a devastating impact on the residents. Mayford was mentioned in the Domesday Book and will end up becoming a gridlocked suburb.	YOUR PLANS	<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding narrow streets and pavements will be highlighted to the County Highways Authority to see what can be done to address the current situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	of this representation
992	Carol	Lawrence	GB7	Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	YOU MUST RECONSIDER YOUR PLANS	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	Primary Heath services locally could not cope with an extra 1000+ patients.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	Primary Heath services locally could not cope with an extra 1000+ patients.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	The proposals at Pyrford will render Ladyplace Farm less viable as a commercial enterprise	None stated.	The need to identify Green Belt land to meet future housing need has been comprehensively explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In general, the impact of proposals on commercial enterprises in the vicinity is not a planning matter unless there are relevant policies that require the protection of the use in that particular area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	The proposals at Pyrford will render Ladyplace Farm less viable as a commercial enterprise	None stated.	The need to identify Green Belt land to meet future housing need has been comprehensively explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In general, the impact of proposals on commercial enterprises in the vicinity is not a planning matter unless there are relevant policies that require the protection of the use in that particular area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	Proposals will result in the loss of historic views to and from Pyrford Escarpment	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features. There is also the requirement that proposals should have regard to the nearby Escarpment landscape and heritage assets. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	Proposals will result in the loss of historic views to and from Pyrford Escarpment	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features. There is also the requirement that proposals should have regard to the nearby Escarpment landscape and heritage assets. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	The loss of Green Belt would affect the character of the area	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	The loss of Green Belt would affect the character of the area	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	The road infrastructure in the area will not cope with the increase in housing numbers	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	The road infrastructure in the area will not cope with the increase in housing numbers	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.	
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB12	There is no capacity in the local schools.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1365	R S	Lawrence	GB13	There is no capacity in the local schools.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	The proposed development fails to meet the Government's five purposes of the Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF, and directly contrary to the first four. As such, the development of the fields adjoining Upshot Lane should be rejected.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	The proposed development fails to meet the Government's five purposes of the Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF, and directly contrary to the first four. As such, the development of the fields adjoining Upshot Lane should be rejected.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	The proposed additional housing would put an impossible burden on overstretched local health services, including doctors, dentists and hospitals. The question would arise as to where the necessary buildings would be put.	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. A similar approach would be taken with the relevant organisations in terms of dentists and hospital provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	The proposed additional housing would put an impossible burden on overstretched local health services, including doctors, dentists and hospitals. The question would arise as to where the necessary buildings would be put.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Completely opposes proposals to build 423 new houses from 2027 to 2040 on fields either side of Upshot Lane.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Completely opposes proposals to build 423 new houses from 2027 to 2040 on fields either side of Upshot Lane.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Building 423 houses would exacerbate existing commuter parking problems at and around West Byfleet station.	None stated.	The Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Building 423 houses would exacerbate existing commuter parking problems at and around West Byfleet station.	None stated.	The Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Amazed that the proposal has got this far as it counters: -the conclusion of the Planning Inspector on the application to build on nearby Randall's field in 1989; -the Government's five stated purposes of Green Belt land; - the recommendations of planning consultants PBA in the Green	None stated.	The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process. Therefore, circumstances are quite different to those in 1989. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, and particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Belt Review.			
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Amazed that the proposal has got this far as it counters: -the conclusion of the Planning Inspector on the application to build on nearby Randall's field in 1989; -the Government's five stated purposes of Green Belt land; - the recommendations of planning consultants PBA in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process. Therefore, circumstances are quite different to those in 1989. This representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0, and particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Proposals give rise to further issues, including ensuring sufficient capacity of primary school places for the existing and future population. It would be impossible to expand the existing primary school, and so a further school would be needed, with potential for further encroachment on to the Green Belt. This would be a planning failure, particularly given the recent demolition of a private school for a luxury housing development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Proposals give rise to further issues, including ensuring sufficient capacity of primary school places for the existing and future population. It would be impossible to expand the existing primary school, and so a further school would be needed, with potential for further encroachment on to the Green Belt. This would be a planning failure, particularly given the recent demolition of a private school for a luxury housing development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Agreeing the proposals would make it more difficult to resist future applications, which are likely to destroy Pyrford as a village and widen urban sprawl from London. Existing and future residents are not likely to want this.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Agreeing the proposals would make it more difficult to resist future applications, which are likely to destroy Pyrford as a village and widen urban sprawl from London. Existing and future residents are not likely to want this.	None stated.	<p>This is not the case, as the proposed sites are proposed to be released from Green Belt through the plan making, rather than development management process, which are distinct. National guidance on the review of Green belt boundaries through the plan-making process is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, and in terms of how this has been followed, please see paragraphs 1.9-1.12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In terms of the impact on Pyrford, the village's character is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	The proposals would irrevocably change Pyrford, eroding its semi-rural nature and resulting in the loss of valuable agricultural land, at a time when population demands for food are increasing.	None stated.	The character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental 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. In addition, as part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	The proposals would irrevocably change Pyrford, eroding its semi-rural nature and resulting in the loss of valuable agricultural land, at a time when population demands for food	None stated.	The character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				are increasing.		sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental 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. In addition, as part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	The proposed additional housing would worsen existing traffic problems, at Coldharbour Road, Old Woking Road 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	The proposed additional housing would worsen existing traffic problems, at Coldharbour Road, Old Woking Road 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB12	Building 423 houses would necessitate further work to ensure already problematic water and gas pressures are improved.	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including water and gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop. More detail on provision of water can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
457	Robert	Layton	GB13	Building 423 houses would necessitate further work to ensure already problematic water and gas pressures are improved.	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including water and gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop. More detail on provision of water can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	Local schools are at capacity, how will new residents with children be accommodated?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.8 In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	Local schools are at capacity, how will new residents with children be accommodated?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.8 In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	Development is on flood plain land which will exacerbate flood problems in the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	Development is on flood plain land which will exacerbate flood problems in the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	There is no Local doctors in Byfleet, the closest area is West Byfleet and this is at capacity. These existing facilities struggle with more people. Recommends that Byfleet has its own surgery	Recommends that Byfleet has its own surgery	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	There is no Local doctors in Byfleet, the closest area is West Byfleet and this is at capacity. These existing facilities struggle with more people. Recommends that Byfleet has its own surgery	Recommends that Byfleet has its own surgery	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	Parvis Road suffers from severe congestion, noise and fumes	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
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	Parvis Road suffers from severe congestion, noise and fumes	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> <p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	It is unreasonable to build on GB land in Byfleet. Much of it has been eroded and the remaining areas are precious to its character	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>With respect to conserving the character of the village, the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	It is unreasonable to build on GB land in Byfleet. Much of it has been eroded and the remaining areas are precious to its character	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	Residents have the right to live in a village that has good local infrastructure including roads, schools, health facilities. More houses cannot be considered until existing problems have been rectified.	None stated.	The representation regarding local infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	Residents have the right to live in a village that have a good local infrastructure including roads, schools, health facilities. More houses cannot be considered until existing problems have been rectified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB4	Refers to a petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council	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
301	Carol	Le Bez	GB5	Refers to a petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
914	A	Le Blanc	General	Promoting GBBR site 24 on the grounds of: bias towards areas in the south of Woking; more overall housing units should be considered; provision of social housing; different area to live; no impact on local woods; proximity to Local Centres; development on site; no flooding or environmental constraints; clearly defined boundaries; adjoins non Green Belt land, possibility of Warbury Lane being closed; no local farmers.	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the suggested site and the reasons put forward to allocate the site for development needs.</p> <p>As noted within the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), this area of Green Belt is of critical importance to three Green Belt purposes. It contributes to the containment of the well-defined urban area, the separation between neighbouring urban areas (in this case Knaphill and Bisley which are less than 0.8km apart) and assisting in safeguarding the attractive rural countryside from encroachment beyond the well defined urban edge. The landscape setting of the area is also considered to be very sensitive to change.</p> <p>The Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1197	Simone	Le Lievre	GB12	We moved to Pyrford because it has a sense of space, does not feel overly populated, has beautiful green/open space nearby, good amenities and schools. Traffic is already a significant concern. I can not see how the road network and schools will cope. What type of housing is planned - will it be in keeping with the area? I do not see how with so many houses planned for the size of site.	Both sites Upshot Lane and Lovelace Drive should not be considered for dwellings. My preference is strongly that neither are built on but given it's unlikely the council will actually listen to public opinion and build anyway, only one of the sites should be considered, definitely not both. It's inherently wrong to build on any kind of greenbelt I'm not sure I understand the purpose of designating greenbelt areas which are considered 'untouchable' if the council can go ahead and build on them anyway? I thought this land was sacred and	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area. The Council will ensure that the houses that will be built will reflect the nature and type of housing needed in the Borough. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					should absolutely remain that way without question		
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches. No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Electricity supply to the site runs across my property. The supply is extremely fragile and would be inadequate for the proposed expansion.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. Over 70% of the site is in Flood Zone 1 where the development will be focused.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road which includes two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping with the road.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Visual impact on my property would be devastating, destroying the open aspect, peace and quiet enjoyment. Please see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy represent my views.	None stated.	The landscape impacts of the proposals are fully assessed and this is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not considered that with sensitive design the proposals will have any significant adverse impacts on the landscape setting or visual amenity of residents in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment. The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14,	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.			
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SNCI sites).	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Traveller sites should be close to schools and services, this site is not. There is no footpath and no easy access to facilities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The site is an established Traveller site. The Council believes that the use can be expanded on the site without undermining the character of the area. The justification to allocate this site for Travellers accommodation is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	My property adjoins the site. Over the last 20 years the large field has developed a seasonal winter pond with reeds.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The justification for allocating ten Acres for further Travellers pitches is set out in Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 4. Flooding matters are covered in Section 5 of the Topic Paper. Overall the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant harm to the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	My property adjoins the site. Over the last 20 years the large field has developed a seasonal winter pond with reeds.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. Over 70% of the site is in Flood Zone 1 where the development will be focused.	No further modification is 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 private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.		
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density. The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Electricity supply to the site runs across my property. The supply is extremely fragile and would be inadequate for the proposed expansion.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The general approach to infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Council will work with utility providers to make sure that development on the site is appropriately connected with electricity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns. Site should not be selected.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The site is unsuitable. The SHLAA noted its physical and environmental problems, including contamination.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the landowner's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
162	Diana	Lea	GB7	Visual impact on my property would be devastating, destroying the open aspect, peace and quiet enjoyment.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The landscape impacts of the proposals are fully assessed and this is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not considered that with sensitive design the proposals will have any significant adverse impacts on the landscape setting or visual amenity of residents in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD		
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Electricity supply to the site runs across my property. The supply is extremely fragile and would be inadequate for the proposed expansion.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council	No further modification is 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	is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Visual impact on my property would be devastating, destroying the open aspect, peace and quiet enjoyment. Please see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy represent my views.	None stated.	The landscape impacts of the proposals are fully assessed and this is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not considered that with sensitive design the proposals will have any significant adverse impacts on the landscape setting or visual amenity of residents in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and Dm7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SSCI sites).	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Traveller sites should be close to schools and services, this site is not. There is no footpath and no easy access to facilities.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	My property adjoins the site. Over the last 20 years the large field has developed a seasonal winter pond with reeds.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	My property adjoins the site. Over the last 20 years the large field has developed a seasonal winter pond with reeds.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Based on the evidence, the Council believes that the site can be developed without damaging any biodiversity on the site. The proposal includes specific key requirements to make sure that biodiversity on the site is enhanced.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site.	of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Electricity supply to the site runs across my property. The supply is extremely fragile and would be inadequate for the proposed expansion.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches. No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. Site could not also be identified in the urban area to meet the needs of Travellers. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
163	Richard	Lea	GB7	Visual impact on my property would be devastating, destroying the open aspect, peace and quiet enjoyment. Please see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy represent my views.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The landscape impacts of the proposals are fully assessed and this is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not considered that with sensitive design the proposals will have any significant adverse impacts on the landscape setting or visual amenity of residents in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
102	Carey	Leach	GB12	Wish to formally register my vehement objection to adding 443 new homes to the Upshot Lane area of Pyrford in order to meet its housing needs. This is Green Belt land, any such development will fundamentally destroy the nature and surrounding area which makes Pyrford and West Byfleet such an attractive place to live. This would totally destroy its charm and character. It completely goes against the Neighbourhood Plan that has been developed by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and the team of local councillors working together, which this proposal and all those submitting it have chosen to ignore.	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. 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. This are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
102	Carey	Leach	GB12	The roads and supporting infrastructure would fall into permanent gridlock with their inability to sustain such a huge development. The roads are busy enough in the mornings with the school run and commuter traffic and the additional of 400 new families is inconceivable, not to mention the impact on the narrow winding roads towards Ripley and the Newark Bridge.	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
102	Carey	Leach	GB12	Medical and school facilities are at capacity and would not cope with such a huge influx of people to support. There has been no consideration to the impact on water supplies and sewerage infrastructure - the water pressure of the village is variable at best.	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	No further modification is 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 proposed allocations can be developed without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
102	Carey	Leach	GB12	I am totally against this proposal on the grounds that the scale of it would destroy Pyrford as a village, the physical infrastructure could not cope with such a huge development and neither could the local schools, medical or public transport support infrastructure.	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
102	Carey	Leach	GB13	Wish to formally register my vehement objection to adding 443 new homes to the Upshot Lane area of Pyrford in order to meet its housing needs. This is Green Belt land, any such development will fundamentally destroy the nature and surrounding area which makes Pyrford and West Byfleet such an attractive place to live. This would totally destroy its charm and character. It completely goes against the Neighbourhood Plan that has been developed by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and the team of local councillors working together, which this proposal and all those submitting it have chosen to ignore.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
102	Carey	Leach	GB13	The roads and supporting infrastructure would fall into permanent gridlock with their inability to sustain such a huge development. The roads are busy enough in the mornings with the school run and commuter traffic and the additional of 400 new families is inconceivable, not to mention the impact on the narrow winding roads towards Ripley and the Newark Bridge.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The 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
102	Carey	Leach	GB13	Medical and school facilities are at capacity and would not cope with such a huge influx of people to support. There has been no consideration to the impact on water supplies and sewerage infrastructure - the water pressure of the village is variable at best.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
102	Carey	Leach	GB13	I am totally against this proposal on the grounds that the scale of it would destroy Pyrford as a village, the physical infrastructure could not cope with such a huge development and neither could the local schools, medical or public transport support infrastructure.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	Object to proposals in Pyrford. Support comments made by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Proposals would encroach on GB land and have a disproportionate negative effect on the character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0, 9.0, 11.0, 15.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	Object to proposals in Pyrford. Support comments made by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Proposals would encroach on GB land and have a disproportionate negative effect on the character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0, 9.0, 11.0, 15.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	Questions the process in which the site was considered and put forward, and whether the decision is based on robust evidence. PNF have identified various flaws and inconsistencies in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	Questions the process in which the site was considered and put forward, and whether the decision is based on robust evidence. PNF have identified various flaws and inconsistencies in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	Local infrastructure will not cope- including schools, medical facilities and utilities.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	Local infrastructure will not cope- including schools, medical facilities and utilities.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	The character of Pyrford and the surrounding landscape and views are important. Proposals would diminish the unique character and setting of Pyrford, including its heritage assets	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 15.0, 19 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	The character of Pyrford and the surrounding landscape and views are important. Proposals would diminish the unique character and setting of Pyrford, including its heritage assets	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 15.0, 19 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust	No further modification is 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>policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	The ecological impact would be significant	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	The ecological impact would be significant	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	Roads are already congested and will massively increase- particularly taking into account the Wisley Airfield development. There are already safety concerns on existing roads. Additional traffic will create gridlock and increase traffic concerns	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	Roads are already congested and will massively increase-particularly taking into account the Wisley Airfield development. There are already safety concerns on existing roads. Additional traffic will create gridlock and increase traffic concerns	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
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB12	Appreciates the need for housing however considers the proposals for Pyrford to be disproportionately high. Considers the site to be geographically prominent and unsuitable for meeting the housing need	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
1339	T.D.	Leader	GB13	Appreciates the need for housing however considers the proposals for Pyrford to be disproportionately high. Considers the site to be geographically prominent and unsuitable for meeting the housing need	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
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	Broad Oaks development will have the biggest impact. The consultation period for the process is too short.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	Broadoaks development will have the biggest impact. The consultation period for the process is too short.	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
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	Broadoaks development will have the biggest impact. The consultation period for the process is too short.	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
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	Broadoaks development will have the biggest impact. The consultation period for the process is too short.	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
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	Has an environmental assessment been carried out and what will happen to the existing wildlife. The site floods regularly, what is the flood alleviation plan?	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	Has an environmental assessment been carried out and what will happen to the existing wildlife. The site floods regularly, what is the flood alleviation plan?	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	Has an environmental assessment been carried out and what will happen to the existing wildlife. The site floods regularly, what is the flood alleviation plan?	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	Has an environmental assessment been carried out and what will happen to the existing wildlife. The site floods regularly, what is the flood alleviation plan?	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	Why is most of the Green Belt in West Byfleet being lost. It will effect local people who use the land and wildlife. Why not use up brownfield land. Development will lead to the loss of character of these area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 15.0 and Section 21.0. In addition, the Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	Why is most of the Green Belt in West Byfleet being lost. It will effect local people who use the land and wildlife. Why not use up brownfield land. Development will lead to the loss of character of these area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 15.0 and Section 21.0. In addition, the Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	Why is most of the Green Belt in West Byfleet being lost. It will effect local people who use the land and wildlife. Why not use up brownfield land. Development will lead to the	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 15.0 and Section 21.0. In addition, the Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				loss of character of these area.		is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	Why is most of the Green Belt in West Byfleet being lost. It will effect local people who use the land and wildlife. Why not use up brownfield land. Development will lead to the loss of character of these area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 15.0 and Section 21.0. In addition, the Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	How will the West Byfleet Health Centre support the additional population	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	How will the West Byfleet Health Centre support the additional population	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	How will the West Byfleet Health Centre support the additional population	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	How will the West Byfleet Health Centre support the additional population	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	The development of Broadoaks can not be looked at in isolation but it is the most pressing concern. Has the impact on the local traffic been taken into consideration. Parvis Road is extremely busy at peak times and this has a knock on effect through to Pyrford. What will the traffic impact be and how will it be addressed, especially with a new school at Broadoaks. This could effect the viability of the whole scheme. The traffic on Parvis Road is already dangerous.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	The development of Broadoaks can not be looked at in isolation but it is the most pressing concern. Has the impact on the local traffic been taken into consideration. Parvis Road is extremely busy at peak times and this has a knock on effect through to Pyrford. What will the traffic impact be and how will it be addressed, especially	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				with a new school at Broadoaks. This could effect the viability of the whole scheme. The traffic on Parvis Road is already dangerous.			
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	The development of Broadoaks can not be looked at in isolation but it is the most pressing concern. Has the impact on the local traffic been taken into consideration. Parvis Road is extremely busy at peak times and this has a knock on effect through to Pyrford. What will the traffic impact be and how will it be addressed, especially with a new school at Broadoaks. This could effect the viability of the whole scheme. The traffic on Parvis Road is already dangerous.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	The development of Broadoaks can not be looked at in isolation but it is the most pressing concern. Has the impact on the local traffic been taken into consideration. Parvis Road is extremely busy at peak times and this has a knock on effect through to Pyrford. What will the traffic impact be and how will it be addressed, especially with a new school at Broadoaks. This could effect the viability of the whole scheme. The traffic on Parvis Road is already dangerous.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	What is the rational for a new school, WBC need to justify this.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	What is the rational for a new school, WBC need to justify this.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	What is the rational for a new school, WBC need to justify this.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	What is the rational for a new school, WBC need to justify this.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB16	How will the local primary schools support the additional pupil numbers	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB15	How will the local primary schools support the additional pupil numbers	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB12	How will the local primary schools support the additional pupil numbers	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
656	Helen	Leckey	GB13	How will the local primary schools support the additional pupil numbers	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				openness of a Green Belt area.		can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. This matter has been comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB7	I strongly object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	Please reconsider your plans	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well 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
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site			
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10. The approach taken to meet the needs of Travellers is addressed in Section 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, the impact on the character of this isolated village community. Development will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core	No further modification is 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.	
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	I accept the proposed secondary school is a special purpose allowed in Green Belt and support the school proposal including mitigation for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, safety measures for students and the public, flooding and run-off.	Please reconsider your plans	The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.			
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has always been clear that the site at Egley Road referred to is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school proposal now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in, for existing and new residents. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Directing traffic down Saunders Lane is ridiculous - a narrow road with pinch points and significant through traffic at inappropriate speeds.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for its occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 25 houses, with two Grade Two listed buildings near Ten Acre Farm. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
243	Claire Victoria	Lee	GB7	Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities required for a Traveller site.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
589	A	Lee	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.			of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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	No further modification is 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>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>	
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	
589	A	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
589	A	Lee	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Traveller related business activities would be out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	This representation has been 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. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB7	The site does not have safe and reasonable access to schools or other local facilities, as there are virtually no local facilities in Mayford village.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to edge of centre sites with good access to jobs, shops and infrastructure. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, 9.0, and 11.0. There is potential for improvements to local infrastructure and services in Mayford, as outlined in Section 3.0 of Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Further to this, there is the opportunity at Site GB9 Egley Road Garden Centre to provide an element of small scale retail and/or community development, to enhance the currently rather dispersed provision in the Mayford area, and better meet the day to day needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the areas and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area considered before the Green Belt. No urban sites have been considered, and doubts the validity of there being no other sites across the whole Borough that are identified or suitable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	Accepts the proposed school as a special purpose for Green Belt land and supportive of associated mitigation measures. However, objects strongly to the leisure centre, running track and sports pitches (and associated café, parking and access) which will have major impacts on an already overloaded and unexpandable road system and is inappropriate within a residential area due to its impacts, and conflicts with the Councils stated 800m separation policy. The association of the leisure and sports proposal with the school proposal represents a lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted. As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority, which has granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities (this decision has not been called in by the Secretary of State). It is not considered that there has been a lack of transparency through this proposal, and the Council's standard procedures in terms of public consultation and availability of planning application documents have been followed.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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. With regard to the justification for the development in a Green Belt location, this is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.			
589	A	Lee	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.		proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	
589	A	Lee	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
589	A	Lee	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	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
589	A	Lee	GB8	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
589	A	Lee	GB9	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB10	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
589	A	Lee	GB11	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
784	Simon	Lee	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The roads are in poor condition and speeding is an issue.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
784	Simon	Lee	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The roads are in poor condition and speeding is an issue.	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
784	Simon	Lee	GB12	Feel strongly about the matter and hope it is reconsidered. Will consider changing political support if the proposals are approved.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is based on objective evidence and not the views or objectives of any political parties. The list of evidence is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
784	Simon	Lee	GB13	Feel strongly about the matter and hope it is reconsidered. Will consider changing political support if the proposals are approved.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is based on objective evidence and not the views or objectives of any political parties. The list of evidence is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
784	Simon	Lee	GB12	There will be further strain on local services. More shops will be needed either on the site or in the village centre, and parking would be an issue.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Pyrford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. Nevertheless the proposed allocations of GB12 and GB13 are within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will continue meet the day to day needs of local people and reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
784	Simon	Lee	GB13	There will be further strain on local services. More shops will be needed either on the site or in the village centre, and parking would be an issue.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Pyrford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. Nevertheless the proposed allocations of GB12 and GB13 are within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will continue meet the day to day needs of local people and reduce 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
						need to travel by car.	
784	Simon	Lee	GB12	The quiet tranquillity, friendliness and historic nature of the village will be lost	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding impact on heritage and 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 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>This representation is also addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
784	Simon	Lee	GB13	The quiet tranquillity, friendliness and historic nature of the village will be lost	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding impact on heritage and 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 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>This representation is also addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha.</p> <p>The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	The likelihood of increased crime as a result of development proposals is an unknown factor. However all development proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy. The policy requires that proposals meet the criteria set out, including to create safe and secure environments, where opportunities for crime are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	The loss of some green field land is inevitable however the Council has sought to identify areas that would have the least impact- this is demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal. In addition, all proposals will need to comply with other development plan policies, including Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation where developer contributions will be sought to make provision for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	
290	David	Leech	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	The Council sympathises with these objections however it is necessary for the Council to identify sites within the Green Belt to deliver sufficient housing in the Borough to meet the identified housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
290	David	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. 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
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha.</p> <p>The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	The likelihood of increased crime as a result of development proposals is an unknown factor. However all development proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy. The policy requires that proposals meet the criteria set out, including to create safe and secure environments, where opportunities for crime are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	The loss of some green field land is inevitable however the Council has sought to identify areas that would have the least impact- this is demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal. In addition, all proposals will need to comply with other development plan policies, including Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation where developer contributions will be sought to make provision for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	The Council sympathises with these objections however it is necessary for the Council to identify sites within the Green Belt to deliver sufficient housing in the Borough to meet the identified housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
291	Christine	Leech	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	6 Conclusions	No comment made.	None stated.	Not applicable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	Both projects access onto Parvis Road. The last major traffic study for this A245 was in 2002. Surrey County Council advised the A245 was 'over trafficked' and 'burdensome' to local communities. Woking Borough Council's 2015 Transport Assessment confirms flows regularly exceed the measure used for congestion but it can take more traffic. The Royal Institute of Planning estimates an increase of movements of 10-15% per annum for development of this scale. The Council is turning a blind eye to the problem.	None stated.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB16	Both projects access onto Parvis Road. The last major traffic study for this A245 was in 2002. Surrey County Council advised the A245 was 'over trafficked' and 'burdensome' to local communities. Woking Borough Council's 2015 Transport Assessment confirms flows regularly exceed the measure used for congestion but it can take more traffic. The Royal Institute of Planning estimates an increase of movements of 10-15% per annum for development of this scale. The Council is turning a blind eye to the problem.	None stated.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	The concern of residents is that a large influx of new patients will overwhelm existing health care facilities.	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 general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB16	The concern of residents is that a large influx of new patients will overwhelm existing health care facilities.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1177	E	Leese	GB16	Woking Borough Council has offered no solution. Education plans do not allow for children coming to live at 'West Hall' or Broadoaks. We have no state secondary school in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision, including schools to serve the development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the information the proposals will be served by adequate educational infrastructure. Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	Woking Borough Council has offered no solution. Education plans do not allow for children coming to live at 'West Hall' or Broadoaks. We have no state secondary school in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals, including school provision are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Planning permission has been granted for the provision of a new secondary school at Egley Road.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB16	A fine balance is being maintained in terms of utilities infrastructure (gas, electricity, fresh water, waste water and sewage collection). A new electricity sub-station is to be built near the Wey Navigation. Woking Borough Council tell us they have asked the utility service providers to comment and have been told there is no problem.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to assess the scale of infrastructure needed to support development. There will be sufficient water and utilities to support the projected growth. The IDP was undertaken in consultation with the utility providers.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	A fine balance is being maintained in terms of utilities infrastructure (gas, electricity, fresh water, waste water and sewage collection). A new electricity sub-station is to be built near the Wey Navigation. Woking Borough Council tell us they have asked the utility service providers to comment and have been told there is no problem. We believe the proposal at West Hall is opportunist - the land is the, the Council has a need for housing development. Green Belt status doesn't seem to matter. The Council has the powers to carry this proposal forward, even against overwhelming opposition. But rules require consideration of siting, health and community care services, school places and utility services. The Council has not met these criteria.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The 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 proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	The Council propose to build 550 new houses and retain further land for later development. 'Broadoaks' is also recommended for release, a plan is about to be submitted by Octagon Developments for 157 new houses and a secondary school. Both will have direct access to Parvis Road and other local infrastructure.	None stated.	Currently, Broadoaks is a Major developed Site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to extend the uses on the site to include housing and elderly people's accommodation. The proposal at West Hall will still be needed to meet future development needs. In parallel to the Site Allocations DPD process, a planning application has been submitted for a school and residential development on the Broadoaks site. The application is yet to be determined. The traffic and infrastructure implication of the Site Allocations DPD proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. The Council will work with the County Council to ensure that the development impacts on Parvis Road is mitigate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB16	We believe the proposal at West Hall is opportunist - the land is the, the Council has a need for housing development. Green Belt status doesn't seem to matter. The Council has the powers to carry this proposal forward, even against overwhelming opposition. But rules require consideration of siting, health and community care services, school places and utility services. The Council has not met these criteria.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The 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 proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB16	The Council propose to build 550 new houses and retain further land for later development. 'Broadoaks' is also recommended for release, a plan is about to be submitted by Octagon Developments for 157 new houses and a secondary school. Both will have direct access to Parvis Road and other local infrastructure.	None stated.	The Council has responsibility to meet both the employment and housing needs of the area. Presently, Broadoaks is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt for high quality offices use. The Site Allocations DPD extends the uses on the site to include residential. In addition, the West Hall proposal will still be needed to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the area. The Site Allocation DPD is prepared in the context of a coherent joint up spatial strategy that focuses most development on brownfield land in the urban areas but with some element of Green Belt land to meet the quantity and type of housing need. The spatial strategy is set out in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. In additional the Council is planning infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1177	E	Leese	GB15	Woking Borough Council has agreed to build not less than 292 new homes borough wide each year. There is enough brown field land and windfall sites until 2021/2022. Thereafter, Green Belt release. Green Belt land protects green spaces and stop one community growing into another. Other than Broadoaks, Green Belt land around West Hall is the only substantial area in West Byfleet. When it's gone, it's gone'. Once a development has started, it will swallow the rest of the land over time.	None stated.	The Housing has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year agreed in the Core Strategy. This is against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 517 dwellings. It is important that the Council identify sufficient land to deliver the 292 housing requirement. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is proposing that Broadoaks be allocated for employment and residential use.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1177	E	Leese	GB16	Other than Broadoaks (already partly developed), the Green Belt land around West Hall is the only substantial area in West Byfleet. When it's gone, it's gone. We are told Green Belt loss to development would be 45 hectares (38%) of the total, not 5-10%! Once a development has been started, it will swallow the rest of the land over time.	None stated.	The Council also has responsibility to meet both the employment and housing needs of the area. Presently, Broadoaks is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt for high quality offices use. The Site Allocations DPD extends the uses on the site to include residential. In addition, the West Hall proposal will still be needed to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	Large scale development would have a negative impact on the local community.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the release of the sites for development will not significantly affect the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The extent of evidence used to support the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	Large scale development would have a negative impact on the local community.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the release of the sites for development will not significantly affect the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The extent of evidence used to support the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	The loss of green space would have a negative impact on local people and wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	The loss of green space would have a negative impact on local people and wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	Development would have an impact on local roads and infrastructure. The existing roads are not suitable for large volumes of traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	Development would have an impact on local roads and infrastructure. The existing roads are not suitable for large volumes of traffic.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living	No further modification is 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>locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	There is currently no public transport and no opportunities to provide any new services. The existing infrastructure and facilities in the area will be inadequate for a larger community.	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
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	There is currently no public transport and no opportunities to provide any new services. The existing infrastructure and facilities in the area will be inadequate for a larger community.	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
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	There is an existing risk of flooding and further development would increase this risk.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	There is an existing risk of flooding and further development would increase this risk.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB7	The existing traveller sites in the borough already provide a sufficient contribution towards the traveller community. Any expansion of the existing site would have a negative impact on leisure, wildlife and landscape of the area.	None stated.	<p>The allocation of Ten Acres to provide pitches is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
68	Piers	Leigh	GB8	Objection for housing but support for a new school on Egley Road.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB8	Housing will result in an increase in traffic on Egley Road which is already congested.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB9	Housing will result in an increase in traffic on Egley Road which is already congested.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB8	Development will eliminate the separation between Woking and Mayford, as well as increasing the risk of merging with Guildford.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB9	Development will eliminate the separation between Woking and Mayford, as well as increasing the risk of merging with Guildford.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB8	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
68	Piers	Leigh	GB9	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB10	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB11	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
68	Piers	Leigh	GB7	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	Large scale development would have a negative impact on the local community.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the release of the sites for development will not significantly affect the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The extent of evidence used to support the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	Large scale development would have a negative impact on the local community.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the release of the sites for development will not significantly affect the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The extent of evidence used to support the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	The loss of green space would have a negative impact on local people and wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	The loss of green space would have a negative impact on local people and wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	Development would have an impact on local roads and infrastructure. The existing roads are not suitable for large volumes of traffic.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	Development would have an impact on local roads and infrastructure. The existing roads are not suitable for large	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				volumes of traffic.		<p>Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	There is currently no public transport and no opportunities to provide any new services. The existing infrastructure and facilities in the area will be inadequate for a larger community.	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
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	There is currently no public transport and no opportunities to provide any new services. The existing infrastructure and facilities in the area will be inadequate for a larger community.	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
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	There is an existing risk of flooding and further development would increase this risk.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	There is an existing risk of flooding and further development would increase this risk.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB7	The existing traveller sites in the borough already provide a sufficient contribution towards the traveller community. Any expansion of the existing site would have a negative impact on leisure, wildlife and landscape of the area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB8	Objection for housing but support for a new school on Egley Road.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB8	Housing will result in an increase in traffic on Egley Road which is already congested.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB9	Housing will result in an increase in traffic on Egley Road which is already congested.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB8	Development will eliminate the separation between Woking and Mayford, as well as increasing the risk of merging with Guildford.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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.	
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB9	Development will eliminate the separation between Woking and Mayford, as well as increasing the risk of merging with Guildford.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB8	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB9	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB10	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB11	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
69	Fenella	Leigh	GB7	The proposed developments would have a significant negative impact on local infrastructure, wildlife and the local community.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Concludes that the proposals are unfair due to their focus in one part of the Borough, and the fact that they play a critical role in fulfilling Green Belt 3 purposes in the area.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. It should be noted that development will be accompanied by supporting infrastructure, as outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Concludes that the proposals are unfair due to their focus in one part of the Borough, and the fact that they play a critical role in fulfilling Green Belt 3 purposes in the area.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. It should be noted that development will be accompanied by supporting infrastructure, as outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough.	The representation has been partly 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. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites are not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough.	The representation has been partly 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. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites are not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB12	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites	The representation has been partly 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	throughout the Borough.	provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites are 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 Pyrford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB13	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough.	The representation has been partly 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. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites are 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 Pyrford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB4	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough.	The representation has been partly 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. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB5	The proposals will concentrate issues in this part of the borough so questions whether traffic, infrastructure and community change etc. have been fully evaluated individually and in combination? Where is the evidence of this? Suggests a broader distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough, to avoid adding to existing traffic problems.	Ensure a wider distribution of proposed Green Belt sites throughout the Borough.	The representation has been partly 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. With regard to the distribution (or concentration) of sites for development, the Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Concludes that further work is needed to thoroughly assess brownfield sites for development in West Byfleet (a clear example being site UA49 - detailed above). Suggests a more sustainable alternative [Broadoaks, as detailed above] which can be delivered without destroying Green Belt land in West Byfleet.	Suggests alternatives to developing this site, at UA49 and changing the allocation of GB16 to solely residential.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The proposed suitable alternative sites (UA49 and GB16) are addressed in the relevant parts of the response to this representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Concludes that further work is needed to thoroughly assess brownfield sites for development in West Byfleet (a clear example being site UA49 - detailed above). Suggests a more sustainable alternative [Broadoaks, as detailed above] which can be delivered without destroying Green Belt land in West Byfleet.	Suggests a more sustainable alternative of changing the allocation of the whole site to residential.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The proposed suitable alternative sites (UA49 and GB16) are addressed in the relevant parts of the response to this representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB12	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB13	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6)	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB4	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB5	What assessment has been made of the impact on air quality due to significant increases in traffic and poor flow? Does this breach air quality targets and if so by how much?	None stated.	While the Borough's Air Quality monitoring for the M25 is high (at times above 50 µg/m ³) and exceeds the limit for nitrogen dioxide of 40 µg/m ³ , set by the Government (DEFRA) the monitoring station is located on a bridge above the motorway, where high levels of nitrogen dioxide would be expected. This high exposure level is not therefore representative of relevant exposure, and generally air pollution in this part of the Borough (Byfleet) does not exceed national air quality standards. However, air quality is monitored regularly and would be reported through Local Air Quality Management process if it were to become an issue. It is also not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6) would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB12	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB13	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB4	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB5	Asks if the Council can show data that the 'traffic mitigation' measures proposed will result in a traffic improvement despite the proposed developments.	None stated.	This detail would be provided and be considered adequate as part of a Transport Assessments at the planning application stage. The representation is further 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
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Thanks the team for the information and assistance provided during the consultation period, and hopes we will consider the feedback in good faith and with an open mind and willingness to consider the points raised.	None stated.	Comments noted, and as with all representations, will be dually considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Thanks the team for the information and assistance provided during the consultation period, and hopes we will consider the feedback in good faith and with an open mind and willingness to consider the points raised.	None stated.	Comments noted, and as with all representations, will be dually considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Concludes that the Green Belt proposals for West Byfleet are not deliverable due to their impacts on infrastructure, particularly traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Concludes that the Green Belt proposals for West Byfleet are not deliverable due to their impacts on infrastructure, particularly traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB12	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB13	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB4	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB5	Outlines the structure of the representation, and provides factual detail and analysis of the sixteen Green Belt sites (GB1-GB16) identified for future development in the DPD. Concludes that 64% of the total dwellings to be delivered on Green Belt sites are in the three adjoining villages of West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleets. Questions whether it is wise to concentrate the majority of development in one corner of the Borough, and whether it is 'fair and reasonable' for residents of these three villages.	None stated.	The numerous points in this objection are noted. 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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	The review of brownfield sites (In West Byfleet) is incomplete and lacks thoroughness -based on an example below, and is therefore opposes the proposals.	None stated.	The assessment of brownfield sites is considered to be comprehensive, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	The review of brownfield sites (In West Byfleet) is incomplete and lacks thoroughness -based on an example below, and is therefore opposes the proposals.	None stated.	The assessment of brownfield sites is considered to be comprehensive, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	There is a more realistic, balanced and deliverable alternative plan that meets the objectives of housing provision for the Borough without all of the negative impacts from the current proposals.	None stated.	Comment noted and responses are given to each point of the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	There is a more realistic, balanced and deliverable alternative plan that meets the objectives of housing provision for the Borough without all of the negative impacts from the current proposals.	None stated.	Comment noted and responses are given to each point of the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Due to the importance of the site to the integrity of the Green Belt, outlined in the GBR, it is put forward solely due to the owner's willingness to sell the land. Questions why is not prioritised for protection until all other alternatives have been exhaustively investigated. The proposal to concentrate the vast majority of Green Belt at West Hall is unfair and also ignores the views of 89% residents responding to a surveys carried out by the Neighbourhood Forum who want to 'keep and robustly protect our present Green Belt boundaries'.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The principle and justification for development in the Green Belt can be found in Section 1.0 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
				Finally questions whether the Council should contact all owners of Green Belt land and assessment potential for development to 2040, rather than relying on a call for sites approach which could miss sites.			
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Due to the importance of the site to the integrity of the Green Belt, outlined in the GBR, it is put forward solely due to the owner's willingness to sell the land. Questions why is not prioritised for protection until all other alternatives have been exhaustively investigated. The proposal to concentrate the vast majority of Green Belt at West Hall is unfair and also ignores the views of 89% residents responding to a surveys carried out by the Neighbourhood Forum who want to 'keep and robustly protect our present Green Belt boundaries'. Finally questions whether the Council should contact all owners of Green Belt land and assessment potential for development to 2040, rather than relying on a call for sites approach which could miss sites.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The principle and justification for development in the Green Belt can be found in Section 1.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Questions whether it is appropriate to focus the majority of Green Belt development in the area given the predicted 33% growth in traffic from Broadoaks (data centre). Also questions specifically whether WBC will rule out development of the West Hall site due the increased impacts recently changed development (for a school) at Broadoaks, or at least change it to a safeguarded site and wait to assess the impact of Broadoaks before taking the West Hall development forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. This site is allocated for development within the plan period (to 2027) due to its sustainability when compared to reasonable alternatives. The assessment of reasonable alternative sites is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Questions whether it is appropriate to focus the majority of Green Belt development in the area given the predicted 33% growth in traffic from Broadoaks (data centre). Also questions specifically whether WBC will rule out development of the West Hall site due the increased impacts recently changed development (for a school) at Broadoaks, or at least change it to a safeguarded site and wait to assess the impact of Broadoaks before taking the West Hall development forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. This site is allocated for development within the plan period (to 2027) due to its sustainability when compared to reasonable alternatives. The assessment of reasonable alternative sites is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Outlines the issues of the Broadoaks site being unused for 15 years due to the Council's strategy for it as an Employment led mixed use site. The change of status recently to residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of the elderly has led to interest and a planning application, but the inclusion of a school will lead to huge increases in traffic, gridlock and is therefore unworkable. Suggests a change to the allocation to make the whole site residential, which could easily deliver the 550 homes required by WBC. The benefits of this are that it could be delivered immediately, could deliver a higher proportion of affordable homes and homes for the elderly than targeted by WBC, its a sustainable location, and traffic at peak times may not be as bad if a significant proportion of accommodation is targeted towards the elderly. From an informal conversation with an employee of Octagon Homes, they would welcome this proposal. In addition there could be development of links to care facilities at West Hall and potentially shared health services.	Remove this site from allocation for housing. Suggests development of links to care facilities at this site and potential for shared health services with Broadoaks, for housing targeted at the elderly there.	As stated, the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. This will include assessment, and if considered appropriate, mitigation of transport and traffic impacts of the development. The point about the lack of use of the Broadoaks site for employment uses is noted, however West Byfleet plays an important role in the Borough's spatial strategy, as its second largest centre (a District Centre) and serving the needs of residents of West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The employment element of the mix of uses proposed at this site is considered to maintain the employment role of West Byfleet, as outlined in the Core Strategy, Policy CS3 West Byfleet District Centre, point 4. and paragraph 4.18. However, any proposed application (including the recent proposal for the school and residential use) will be considered on its merits, in relation to the draft allocation and the Council's Core Strategy, particularly Policies CS3 and CS15 Sustainable Economic Development. The West Hall site is considered a generally sustainable location for housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Outlines the issues of the Broadoaks site being unused for 15 years due to the Council's strategy for it as an Employment led mixed use site. The change of status recently to residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of the elderly led almost immediately to a plan from Octagon Homes, but the inclusion	Proposes that the whole site is allocated for residential use (and could deliver 550+	As stated, the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. This will include assessment, and if considered appropriate, mitigation of transport and traffic impacts of the development. The point about the lack of use of the Broadoaks site for employment uses is noted, however West Byfleet plays an important role in the Borough's spatial strategy, as its second largest centre (a District Centre) and serving the needs of residents of West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The employment element	No further modification is 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 a school will lead to huge increases in traffic, gridlock and is therefore unworkable. Suggests a change to the allocation to make the whole site residential, which could easily deliver the 550 homes required by WBC. The benefits of this are that it could be delivered immediately, could deliver a higher proportion of affordable homes and homes for the elderly than targeted by WBC, its a sustainable location, and traffic at peak times may not be as bad if a significant proportion of accommodation is targeted towards the elderly. From an informal conversation with an employee of Octagon Homes, they would welcome this proposal. In addition there could be development of links to care facilities at West Hall and potentially shared health services.	homes), including a high proportion of affordable housing and housing targeted to the needs of the elderly.	of the mix of uses proposed at this site is considered to maintain the employment role of West Byfleet, as outlined in the Core Strategy, Policy CS3 West Byfleet District Centre, point 4. and paragraph 4.18. However, any proposed application (including the recent proposal for the school and residential use) will be considered on its merits, in relation to the draft allocation and the Council's Core Strategy, particularly Policies CS3 and CS15 Sustainable Economic Development.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Outlines that the evidence available does not provide full details of all the brownfield sites examined, that there is not external independent evidence to show the review of brownfield sites has been thorough, and therefore there is no documentation to allow residents to test or challenge assumptions, conclusions and judgements made. Outlines a concern in this regard about site UA49 and its allocation for industrial use when it should be allocated for residential. Picks out wording on there being significant contamination likely but questions whether decontamination has been assessed and costed. Questions whether WBC should employ an external consultancy to undertake a complete and detailed analysis of brownfield sites in the Borough; whether a 'call for sites' exercise should be undertaken for brownfield sites for the period of the plan (to 2040) and asks the Council to contact all the owners of developed sites in the Borough to understand their intentions to 2040, to give a more complete picture of future availability of land for development.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The Core Strategy identifies need for a range of uses, including warehouse floorspace, as part of its broad spatial and economic strategy for the Borough. Also, existing need figures are based on existing levels of floorspace e.g. for industrial floorspace. If floorspace is lost in a way not planned for, need figures across the Borough may well increase. Decontamination is an issue on many allocated sites, including those allocated for residential, and as outlined would not preclude allocation of suitable uses (dependent on the location) but mean that key requirements and other Council policies would apply to ensure adequate decontamination.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Outlines that the evidence available does not provide full details of all the brownfield sites examined, that there is not external independent evidence to show the review of brownfield sites has been thorough, and therefore there is no documentation to allow residents to test or challenge assumptions, conclusions and judgements made. Outlines a concern in this regard about site UA49 and its allocation for industrial use when it should be allocated for residential. Picks out wording on there being significant contamination likely but questions whether decontamination has been assessed and costed. Questions whether WBC should employ an external consultancy to undertake a complete and detailed analysis of brownfield sites in the Borough; whether a 'call for sites' exercise should be undertaken for brownfield sites for the period of the plan (to 2040) and asks the Council to contact all the owners of developed sites in the Borough to understand their intentions to 2040, to give a more complete picture of future availability of land for development.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of alternative sites, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0. The Core Strategy identifies need for a range of uses, including warehouse floorspace, as part of its broad spatial and economic strategy for the Borough. Also, existing need figures are based on existing levels of floorspace e.g. for industrial floorspace. If floorspace is lost in a way not planned for, need figures across the Borough may well increase. Decontamination is an issue on many allocated sites, including those allocated for residential, and as outlined would not preclude allocation of suitable uses (dependent on the location) but mean that key requirements and other Council policies would apply to ensure adequate decontamination.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Outlines that the loss of Green Belt in West Byfleet is 43.5%, which is unfair and unacceptable, particularly as many other war in the Borough remain untouched. The Green Belt Review's assessment of land around West Hall highlights its importance to three Green Belt purposes and the sensitivity to change of the West Hall site. The willingness to eliminate Green Belt in West Byfleet (a sacrifice that benefits the rest of the Borough) will mean urban sprawl will be unchecked, neighbouring towns will merge (with a continuous built up area from Weybridge, Byfleet, West Byfleet to Pyrford) and the countryside will be open to encroachment. States that the	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The representation is further dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 15.0 and 21.0. While it is acknowledged that there is no secondary school	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				GBR's contention that there is a secondary school and community centre in West Byfleet are incorrect, and mean that it would be ranked to high in terms of assessment scores on sustainability.		within West Byfleet itself, the GBR would be referring to Bishop David Brown School in Sheerwater, which is reasonably nearby (1 mile from the centre of West Byfleet District Centre). Community centre provision is at the Cornerstone Centre, attached to St John's Church, amongst other locations in West Byfleet.	
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Outlines that the loss of Green Belt in West Byfleet is 43.5%, which is unfair and unacceptable, particularly as many other war in the Borough remain untouched. The Green Belt Review's assessment of land around West Hall highlights its importance to three Green Belt purposes and the sensitivity to change of the West Hall site. The willingness to eliminate Green Belt in West Byfleet (a sacrifice that benefits the rest of the Borough) will mean urban sprawl will be unchecked, neighbouring towns will merge (with a continuous built up area from Weybridge, Byfleet, West Byfleet to Pyrford) and the countryside will be open to encroachment. States that the GBR's contention that there is a secondary school and community centre in West Byfleet are incorrect, and mean that it would be ranked to high in terms of assessment scores on sustainability.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The representation is further dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 15.0 and 21.0. While it is acknowledged that there is no secondary school within West Byfleet itself, the GBR would be referring to Bishop David Brown School in Sheerwater, which is reasonably nearby (1 mile from the centre of West Byfleet District Centre). Community centre provision is at the Cornerstone Centre, attached to St John's Church, amongst other locations in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB12	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB13	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	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
				generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.			of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB4	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB5	Outlines the traffic issues in West Byfleet highlighted in the 2026 Transport Assessment Report, including detail of trip generation from the Broadoaks site and from the Pyrford area leading into West Byfleet. Traffic mitigation steps highlighted are woefully inadequate. Existing levels of traffic already cause significant impacts to journey times, are beyond 'theoretical capacity' and reduce the attractiveness of West Byfleet as an economic centre. Outlines the knock on problems of vehicles seeking alternative routes through Wisley and Ripley. It is therefore irresponsible and inappropriate to place major development, particularly due to the combined traffic impacts from West Byfleet, Pyrford and Byfleet in one part of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB15	Judges the proposals to be ill advised, inadequate and would cause irreparable damage to the quality of life for residents.	None stated.	The representation is supported by an array of background evidence, as outlined in Sections 8.0 and 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The representation is further addressed in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1407	Andrew	Leong-Son	GB16	Judges the proposals to be ill advised, inadequate and would cause irreparable damage to the quality of life for residents.	None stated.	The representation is supported by an array of background evidence, as outlined in Sections 8.0 and 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The representation is further addressed in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	SPA sites were discounted for consideration due to its status for protecting endangered birds. However Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Areas" and should be similarly protected. Mayford Village Society are pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath to SPA.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	SPA sites were discounted for consideration due to its status for protecting endangered birds. However Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Areas" and should be similarly protected. Mayford Village Society are pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath to SPA.	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	SPA sites were discounted for consideration due to its status for protecting endangered birds. However Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Areas" and should be similarly protected. Mayford Village Society are pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath to SPA.	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach for including and discounting sites WBC have included the 10 Acre site even though the GBBR rejected it	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach for including and discounting sites WBC have included the 10 Acre site even though the GBBR rejected it	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach for including and discounting sites WBC have included the 10 Acre site even though the GBBR rejected it	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	An increase in Traveller pitches will reduce the visual amenity of the area and increase risk to wildlife on the adjoining SSSI	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	A sequential approach should have been applied (urban areas before the GB). Questions the validity of the approach taken to identifying suitable sites.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The GB is fundamental to ensuring Woking, Mayford and Guildford remain separate. It is only considered important in the GBBR	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Does not understand how a planning application has come forward on the site before the Site Allocation DPD has been adopted. The NPPF states that sites can only be removed from the GB under special circumstances and as part of the Local Plan. The Council is ignoring this requirement	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>There is no planning instrument to prevent applicants from submitting a proposal at any point. Planning proposals will be determined against the policies relevant at the time. Although the draft Site Allocation had been published for Regulation 18 public consultation and could be material consideration, limited weight was given to it.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here.	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Objects to building a new school to accommodate children from new sites GB9,10,11. Believes that the development of a school would improve the chances of development on other Mayford sites and/or provides a justification for bringing forward sites in advance of 2027 if delivery of other sites are slow.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	Objects to building a new school to accommodate children from new sites GB9,10,11. Believes that the development of a school would improve the chances of development on other Mayford sites and/or provides a justification for bringing forward sites in advance of 2027 if delivery of other sites are slow.	None stated.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very	No further modification is 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>special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	Objects to building a new school to accommodate children from new sites GB9,10,11. Believes that the development of a school would improve the chances of development on other Mayford sites and/or provides a justification for bringing forward sites in advance of 2027 if delivery of other sites are slow.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	Objects to building a new school to accommodate children from new sites GB9,10,11. Believes that the development of a school would improve the chances of development on other Mayford sites and/or provides a justification for bringing forward sites in advance of 2027 if delivery of other sites are slow.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Objects to the associated new leisure centre, running track, football, sports pitches- considers this to be inappropriate development within a residential area- reference made to the Council's 800m separation policy. 5000 visits per week will overload existing strained roads and the proposal will have a major amenity impact for residents in the direct vicinity. The proposal is inappropriate and represents a lack of transparency from the Council	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate. The character of the unique and historic village will be destroyed. The proposals create a have a disproportionate impact on Mayford residents whom chose to live in this environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 19.0, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate. The character of the unique and historic village will be destroyed. The proposals create a have a disproportionate impact on Mayford residents whom chose to live in this environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 19.0, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <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>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	<p>The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.</p> <p>The character of the unique and historic village will be destroyed.</p> <p>The proposals create a have a disproportionate impact on Mayford residents whom chose to live in this environment.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 19.0, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	<p>The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.</p> <p>The character of the unique and historic village will be destroyed.</p> <p>The proposals create a have a disproportionate impact on Mayford residents whom chose to live in this environment.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 19.0, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	<p>Infrastructure factors to consider:</p> <p>The GBBR recommends Mayford on the basis of distance to the Town Centre. It suggests it take 7 minutes between the two, in fact it can take over 30 mins at peak times.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	<p>Infrastructure factors to consider:</p> <p>The GBBR recommends Mayford on the basis of distance to the Town Centre. It suggests it take 7 minutes between the two, in fact it can take over 30 mins at peak times.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	Infrastructure factors to consider: The GBBR recommends Mayford on the basis of distance to the Town Centre. It suggests it take 7 minutes between the two, in fact it can take over 30 mins at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	Infrastructure factors to consider: The GBBR recommends Mayford on the basis of distance to the Town Centre. It suggests it take 7 minutes between the two, in fact it can take over 30 mins at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The site includes an escarpment and rising ground and should be discounted in line with NE7 and CS24. A Landscape Character Assessment has not been carried out and puts the validity of the review into question	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	SPA sites were discounted for consideration due to its status for protecting endangered birds. However Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Areas" and should be similarly protected. Mayford Village Society are pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath to SPA.	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The road network in Mayford is inadequate-narrow, unlit, few pedestrian footpaths, congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus service The route towards Worplesdon Station is inaccessible. The three single lane bridges in the area are inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic. additional services in Worplesdon will add to congestion	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council is aware of public transport deficiencies. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Strategy.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	<p>The road network in Mayford is inadequate-narrow, unlit, few pedestrian footpaths, congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.</p> <p>Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus service</p> <p>The route towards Worplesdon Station is inaccessible.</p> <p>The three single lane bridges in the area are inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>additional services in Worplesdon will add to congestion</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council is aware of public transport deficiencies. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	<p>The road network in Mayford is inadequate-narrow, unlit, few pedestrian footpaths, congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.</p> <p>Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus service</p> <p>The route towards Worplesdon Station is inaccessible.</p> <p>The three single lane bridges in the area are inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>additional services in Worplesdon will add to congestion</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council is aware of public transport deficiencies. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	<p>The road network in Mayford is inadequate-narrow, unlit, few pedestrian footpaths, congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.</p> <p>Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus service</p> <p>The route towards Worplesdon Station is inaccessible.</p> <p>The three single lane bridges in the area are inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>additional services in Worplesdon will add to congestion</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council is aware of public transport deficiencies. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused planning permission on the site as it would reduce the openness of the GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has strong historical connections. The GBBR was incorrect to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' as it did not consider Woking to have a particularly strong historic	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
				character.		In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has strong historical connections. The GBBR was incorrect to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' as it did not consider Woking to have a particularly strong historic character.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has strong historical connections. The GBBR was incorrect to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' as it did not consider Woking to have a particularly strong historic character.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has strong historical connections. The GBBR was incorrect to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' as it did not consider Woking to have a particularly strong historic character.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egle Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fields	None stated.	The site at Egle 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egle Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fields	None stated.	The site at Egle 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egle Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fields	None stated.	The site at Egle 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egle Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fields	None stated.	The site at Egle 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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure.	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 Egle 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
				Reconsider plans		<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>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 see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 3.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure. Reconsider plans	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The 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 see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 3.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure. Reconsider plans	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The 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 see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 3.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there only a only a Post Office and barbers and no other supporting infrastructure. Reconsider plans	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 3.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach for including and discounting sites WBC have included the 10 Acre site even though the GBBR rejected it	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works are planned. The roads are inadequate, narrow and with pinch points at railway bridges. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern e.g. pedestrian route to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works are planned. The roads are inadequate, narrow and with pinch points at railway bridges. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern e.g. pedestrian route to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works are planned. The roads are inadequate, narrow and with pinch points at railway bridges. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern e.g. pedestrian route to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works are planned. The roads are inadequate, narrow and with pinch points at railway bridges. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern e.g. pedestrian route to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	With less than two miles between Mayford and Slyfield there is a high risk of coalescence of Woking and Guildford. The proposals here will see the natural growth towards Guildford. Strong boundaries (rail line, road, rivers, woodlands etc.) already exist in defining the GB boundary. The proposal	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				would make the GB boundary weaker by the removal of the escarpment.		<p>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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p>	
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	<p>With less than two miles between Mayford and Slyfield there is a high risk of coalescence of Woking and Guildford. The proposals here will see the natural growth towards Guildford.</p> <p>Strong boundaries (rail line, road, rivers, woodlands etc.) already exist in defining the GB boundary. The proposal would make the GB boundary weaker by the removal of the escarpment.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	<p>With less than two miles between Mayford and Slyfield there is a high risk of coalescence of Woking and Guildford. The proposals here will see the natural growth towards Guildford.</p> <p>Strong boundaries (rail line, road, rivers, woodlands etc.) already exist in defining the GB boundary. The proposal would make the GB boundary weaker by the removal of the escarpment.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	<p>With less than two miles between Mayford and Slyfield there is a high risk of coalescence of Woking and Guildford. The proposals here will see the natural growth towards Guildford.</p> <p>Strong boundaries (rail line, road, rivers, woodlands etc.) already exist in defining the GB boundary. The proposal would make the GB boundary weaker by the removal of the escarpment.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	<p>Traveller sites should have adequate amenity including space for related business activities. There are 25 houses and two Grade II listed buildings. The proposals are not in keeping with the local area</p>	None stated.	<p>It is accepted that one of the key requirements for Ten Acre Farm could give the false impression that the site is also allocated for a business use. That is not the intention of the requirement. The requirement is intended to emphasise that the allocation should facilitate the traditional way of life of Travellers. The requirement will be amended in this regard to address this concern.</p> <p>The representation regarding 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 of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate access to services/facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to schools and local facilities.	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB7	If no sites are available in the urban area, priority should be given to the urban edge close to services/facilities. Mayford does not satisfy these criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB8	The Council openly states that land available for development is more viable. Ownership status should not have a bearing on whether sites should be removed from the GB	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB9	The Council openly states that land available for development is more viable. Ownership status should not have a bearing on whether sites should be removed from the GB	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB10	The Council openly states that land available for development is more viable. Ownership status should not have a bearing on whether sites should be removed from the GB	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
1325	Clive	Leswell	GB11	The Council openly states that land available for development is more viable. Ownership status should not have a bearing on whether sites should be removed from the GB	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
1158		Levy	GB15	The Green Belt acts as a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. It also reduces the noise of the M25. The land also floods and will need to be considered.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control noise and pollution as a result of the proposals. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Byfleet and West Byfleet as separate communities. Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB15	I am very strongly opposed to use of Green Belt at West Hall. Fail to see how this would meet national planning policy stated Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The 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 proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB15	I fail to see how the Council's additional context - regarding preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough and assessment of the landscape character - is being achieved by the proposed use of West Hall.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The 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 proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB15	Main concern is about the impact on the volume of traffic on Parvis Road. The existing traffic is already at a standstill, partly due to the development of Brooklands. Congestion will have a negative impact on emergency services. The WBC Transport Evaluation 2010 does not take into account development in this part of the borough and therefore is not relevant to the assessment of the release of Green Belt land around West Hall.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1158		Levy	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. It concluded that the DPD will promote sustainable development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB16	<p>It is necessary to view the future use of West Hall land in the context of the 44 acre Broadoaks site. If sensitively developed, Broadoaks could become a major asset to the community and meet some housing needs. Development of this site will exacerbate existing traffic , increase pressure on schools, health care, public transport, water supply and sewerage services.</p> <p>I would be interested in your comments on my view of Green Belt areas and the actions you will take to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and “joined-up” plan.</p>	None stated.	The Council has responsibility to meet both the employment and housing needs of the area. Presently, Broadoaks is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt for high quality offices use. The Site Allocations DPD extends the uses on the site to include residential. In addition, the West Hall proposal will still be needed to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the area. The Site Allocation DPD is prepared in the context of a coherent joint up spatial strategy that focuses most development on brownfield land in the urban areas but with some element of Green Belt land to meet the quantity and type of housing need. The spatial strategy is set out in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. In additional the Council is planning infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB15	No Green Belt within West Byfleet village - there is very little natural green space in West Byfleet. The Wey Navigation has historic importance and enjoyed for recreational uses. Development will have a negative impact on Wey Navigation which is an important wildlife corridor. The Wey Navigation is used for recreational purposes and should be protected. If this plan was to go ahead we could have no Green Belt area within our village.	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will compromise the ecological integrity of the Wey Navigation. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1158		Levy	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. It concluded that the DPD will promote sustainable development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	The Green Belt acts as a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. It also reduces the noise of the M25. The land also floods and will need to be considered.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB16	Development of this site will exacerbate existing traffic , increase pressure on schools, health care, public transport, water supply and sewerage services.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1204	D	Levy	GB16	I would be interested in your comments on my view of Green Belt areas and the actions you will take to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and “joined-up” plan.	None stated.	The Site Allocation DPD is prepared in the context of a coherent joint up spatial strategy that focuses most development on brownfield land in the urban areas but with some element of Green Belt land to meet the quantity and type of housing need. The spatial strategy is set out in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. In addition the Council is planning infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	I fail to see how the Council's additional context - regarding preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough and assessment of the landscape character - is being achieved by the proposed use of West Hall.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	Main concern is about the impact on the volume of traffic on Parvis Road. The existing traffic is already at a standstill, partly due to the development of Brooklands. Congestion will have a negative impact on emergency services. The WBC Transport Evaluation 2010 does not take into account development in this part of the borough and therefore is not relevant to the assessment of the release of Green Belt land around West Hall.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed, with particular reference to infrastructure	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. It concluded that the DPD will promote sustainable development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB16	It is necessary to view the future use of West Hall land in the context of the 44 acre Broadoaks site. If sensitively developed, Broadoaks could become a major asset to the community and meet some housing needs.	None stated.	Broadoaks is already designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. Because the site has not come forward for development since this designation, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to expend the uses on the site to include residential development and elderly people's accommodation. The Council will make sure through the application of the key requirements of the proposal that the site is sensitively developed. In addition to Broadoaks, West Hall will also be needed to contribute to meeting the development needs of the area, and its allocation is justified by the Council's available evidence. The impacts of both proposals, in particular, the traffic impacts are assessed. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land including West Hall for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	
1204	D	Levy	GB15	No Green Belt within West Byfleet village - there is very little natural green space in West Byfleet. The Wey Navigation has historic importance and enjoyed for recreational uses. Development will have a negative impact on Wey Navigation which is an important wildlife corridor. The Wey Navigation is used for recreational purposes and should be protected. If this plan was to go ahead we could have no Green Belt area within our village.	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will compromise the ecological integrity of the Wey Navigation. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	I am very strongly opposed to use of Green Belt at West Hall. Fail to see how this would meet national planning policy stated Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. It concluded that the DPD will promote sustainable development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1204	D	Levy	GB15	Woking is one of nine areas assessed as having 'extensive' areas of flood zone 3 without significant flood infrastructure. It does not benefit from the minimum standard of protection. The Infrastructure Development Plan is vague on flooding. Given the sites' proximity to the Wey Navigation there must be considerable flood and surface water risk.	None stated.	Flooding issues are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	The likelihood of increased crime as a result of development proposals is an unknown factor. However all development proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy. The policy requires that proposals meet the criteria set out, including to create safe and secure environments, where opportunities for crime are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	The loss of some green field land is inevitable however the Council has sought to identify areas that would have the least impact- this is demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal. In addition, all proposals will need to comply with other development plan policies, including Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation where developer contributions will be sought to make provision for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	The Council sympathises with these objections however it is necessary for the Council to identify sites within the Green Belt to deliver sufficient housing in the Borough to meet the identified housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
257	Joan	Lewis	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
896	Amy	Lewis	GB15	Questions why housing are not spread equally across all Green Belt sites; whether all Brownfield sites have been exhausted and; why propose such a high density compared against lower densities opposite the site.	I suggest alternative entrances need to be created on the West Hall site so that not all of the residents will need to come in and out via Parvis road so that the increase in traffic can be spread out more evenly.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
896	Amy	Lewis	GB15	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Questions how the increase in traffic will be remedied. Traffic lights will make the situation worse, as seen outside the Marist School. A new roundabout will help traffic flow.	I suggest alternative entrances need to be created on the West Hall site so that not all of the residents will need to come in and out via Parvis road so that the increase in traffic can be spread out more evenly.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent Smarts Heath Common SSSI.	None stated.	The justification for allocating the site is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on	No further modification is 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's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife.	None stated.	<p>It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, the impact on the character of this isolated village community. Development will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character.		of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB14	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB11	<p>No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade</p> <p>the roads or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or 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. There will be gridlock. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or 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. There will be gridlock. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB14	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More cars will place more strain on the transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges or to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure, there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1077	Tim Catherine	Lewis	GB7	I strongly object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	The proposed sites are on the edge of Pyrford Common Site of Nature Conservation Importance and other areas of ecological importance. The additional population will increase access to these sites, threaten wildlife and reduce biodiversity of the area.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	The proposed sites are on the edge of Pyrford Common Site of Nature Conservation Importance and other areas of ecological importance. The additional population will increase access to these sites, threaten wildlife and reduce biodiversity of the area.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	There is insufficient transport and utility infrastructure for the proposed increase in population. Additional cars will increase air and noise pollution, journey times and put pressure on A&E departments. Church Hill and Upshot Lane are narrow and Newark Bridge single track, and together with development in Send and Wisley Airfield, the proposed development will exacerbate congestion and raise safety concerns. Both Parvis Road and Old Woking Road have reached capacity and proposed Broadoaks development will worsen this.	None stated.	<p>The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand from that development. This is outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and also Section 24.0. The potential increase in air and noise pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. The sites identified for allocation have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions, by promoting walking and cycling and contributing to improved public transport. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the submitted Development Management Policies DPD has specific policies relating to pollution (DM5 Environmental Pollution and DM6 Air and Water Quality). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of air pollution above the existing baseline condition.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	There is insufficient transport and utility infrastructure for the proposed increase in population. Additional cars will increase air and noise pollution, journey times and put pressure on A&E departments. Church Hill and Upshot Lane are narrow and Newark Bridge single track, and together with development in Send and Wisley Airfield, the proposed development will exacerbate congestion and raise safety concerns. Both Parvis Road and Old Woking Road have reached capacity and proposed Broadoaks development will worsen this.	None stated.	<p>The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand from that development. This is outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and also Section 24.0. The potential increase in air and noise pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. The sites identified for allocation have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions, by promoting walking and cycling and contributing to improved public transport. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the submitted Development Management Policies DPD has specific policies relating to pollution (DM5 Environmental Pollution and DM6 Air and Water Quality). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of air pollution above the existing baseline condition.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	The social environment will be adversely affected. The development of 423 houses is an increase of over 20% of Pyrford's existing housing stock, and will alter the village's character and social dimension.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	The social environment will be adversely affected. The development of 423 houses is an increase of over 20% of Pyrford's existing housing stock, and will alter the village's character and social dimension.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	The physical environment will be severely degraded, in terms of loss of views from Pyrford over unspoilt Surrey Hills countryside and loss of recreational space for all of the Borough.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraph 7.4 and Section 21.0. The site allocations key requirements call for the sensitive handling of site topography and for a landscape assessment in any forthcoming development. The site is not noted for its recreational value. In addition, Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed for the proposed use without significant damage to the surrounding environment. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes ensuring that environmental impacts are fully assessed, and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	The physical environment will be severely degraded, in terms of loss of views from Pyrford over unspoilt Surrey Hills countryside and loss of recreational space for all of the Borough.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraph 7.4 and Section 21.0. The site allocations key requirements call for the sensitive handling of site topography and for a landscape assessment in any forthcoming development. The site is not noted for its recreational value. In addition, Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed for the proposed use without significant damage to the surrounding environment. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes ensuring that environmental impacts are fully assessed, and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Green Belt is agreed at national and not local level. The National Planning Policy states "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." Questions whether the Council can overturn this policy, whether is should instead be encouraging urban renewal and recycling of derelict urban land rather than developing areas of prime agricultural value and scenic beauty.	None stated.	Comment noted, however National Planning Policy sets out that alterations to Green Belt boundaries can be made (only in exceptional circumstances) through the preparation of the Local Plan - at a local, and not national, level. More comprehensive coverage of the justification for release of these sites from the Green Belt can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0. Consideration of urban sprawl can be found in Section 15.0. of this paper, and recycling of urban land and assessment of reasonable alternative sites in Sections 16.0 and 9.0 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Green Belt is agreed at national and not local level. The National Planning Policy states "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." Questions whether the Council can overturn this policy, whether is should instead be encouraging urban renewal and recycling of derelict urban land rather than developing areas of prime agricultural value and scenic beauty.	None stated.	Comment noted, however National Planning Policy sets out that alterations to Green Belt boundaries can be made (only in exceptional circumstances) through the preparation of the Local Plan - at a local, and not national, level. More comprehensive coverage of the justification for release of these sites from the Green Belt can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0. Consideration of urban sprawl can be found in Section 15.0. of this paper, and recycling of urban land and assessment of reasonable alternative sites in Sections 16.0 and 9.0 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB16	Development at Broadoaks will worsen traffic and congestion in Pyrford (on Parvis and Old Woking Roads).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	There will be impacts on provision of local education: - Questions whether the current expansion of Pyrford primary	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.8, and Section 24.0. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for	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
				school will have capacity for children living in the new development. Same question about adequate capacity for pre-school children. -Raises concern that the proposed 900 student school at Broadoaks will increase congestion but not provide the necessary additional state school places. These places are required immediately, and the proposed site in Mayford will be insufficient to meet additional demand, and also increase traffic flow.		an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	There will be impacts on provision of location education, health and policing. -Questions whether the current expansion of Pyrford primary school will have capacity for children living in the new development. Same question about adequate capacity for pre-school children. -Raises concern that the proposed 900 student school at Broadoaks will increase congestion but not provide the necessary additional state school places. These places are required immediately, and the proposed site in Mayford will be insufficient to meet additional demand, and also increase traffic flow.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.8, and Section 24.0. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Appreciates that village life has to evolve with the times, and that refusing any development is not in the national or local interest. Alternative locations exist and include sites on Pyrford Road and Martyrs Lane. These alternatives should be more thoroughly reviewed.	Alternative sites suggested on Pyrford Road and Martyrs Lane. These should be thoroughly reviewed.	The alternatives to the sites put forward have been fully assessed, as outlined in the Council's Issue and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Further detail of the sites mentioned in this representation would need to be obtained in order to provide feedback on the suitability of these specific sites for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Appreciates that village life has to evolve with the times, and that refusing any development is not in the national or local interest. Alternative locations exist and include sites on Pyrford Road and Martyrs Lane. These alternatives should be more thoroughly reviewed.	Alternative sites suggested on Pyrford Road and Martyrs Lane. These should be thoroughly reviewed.	The alternatives to the sites put forward have been fully assessed, as outlined in the Council's Issue and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Further detail of the sites mentioned in this representation would need to be obtained in order to provide feedback on the suitability of these specific sites for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Proposed development would put additional demand on existing sewage pipes, which are inadequate and have lead to sewage flooding. Larger pipes need to be installed to deal with demand.	The necessary sewage infrastructure should be installed to service current and future properties, and avoid sewage flooding	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10, and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Proposed development would put additional demand on existing sewage pipes, which are inadequate and have lead to sewage flooding. Larger pipes need to be installed to deal with demand.	The necessary sewage infrastructure should be installed to service current and future properties, and avoid sewage flooding	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10, and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	The proposed development will increase the need for already full parking provision at West Byfleet Station. It will also add to illegal parking around local schools, constricting traffic flow and lead to greater safety issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	The proposed development will increase the need for already full parking provision at West Byfleet Station. It will also add to illegal parking around local schools, constricting traffic flow and lead to greater safety issues.	None stated.	This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet. Despite this, the enforcement of parking with regard to people parking on kerbs and blocking pedestrian access is outside the remit of planning, but should be addressed and will be flagged to the relevant department/ organisation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	The water and sewage network is under pressure and unable to cope with current rainfall. Developing agricultural land will increase run-off and create more flash floods, particularly in an era of climate change and more volatile weather	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
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	The water and sewage network is under pressure and unable to cope with current rainfall. Developing agricultural land will increase run-off and create more flash floods, particularly in an era of climate change and more volatile weather	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
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	There will be impacts in provision of local policing. Coverage is already sparse. Would the 20% increase in households be matched by additional police resources?	None stated.	The proposals would not increase the number of households in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford by anything like 20% and it is not expected that the need for additional police resources 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	There will be impacts in provision of local policing. Coverage is already sparse. Would the 20% increase in households be matched by additional police resources?	None stated.	The proposals would not increase the number of households in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford by anything like 20% and it is not expected that the need for additional police resources 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	There will be impacts on local health services. Questions whether there will be increased capacity to cater for additional households.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	There will be impacts on local health services. Questions whether there will be increased capacity to cater for additional households.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Believes that the proposed development will be to the overall detriment of Pyrford and the surrounding areas. This is based on the following factors (see next reps):	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and these allocations, and a response to various impacts of development, are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Believes that the proposed development will be to the overall detriment of Pyrford and the surrounding areas. This is based on the following factors (see next reps):	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and these allocations, and a response to various impacts of development, are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Is the increased need for gas associated with proposed development accommodated within current gas upgrade work, or will there need to be further upgrades (with associated inconvenient roadworks) in future?	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Is the increased need for gas associated with proposed development accommodated within current gas upgrade work, or will there need to be further upgrades (with associated inconvenient roadworks) in future?	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Would like to be assured that deliberations include the effect of other development proposed in the local area, involving both Woking and Guildford Borough Councils to ensure that a coherent, sustainable plan is generated.	None stated.	The Council has engaged with Guildford Borough Council, and other neighbouring authorities, through this consultation and in line with the (nationally set) Duty to Cooperate. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraph 6.2. The Council also meets regularly with Guildford to discuss strategic issues, and is similarly involved in inputting in Guildford's Local Plan proposals. As such, as also in liaison with the County Council, it is considered that coherent, sustainable plans are being developed between and within Woking and Guildford Boroughs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Would like to be assured that deliberations include the effect of other development proposed in the local area, involving both Woking and Guildford Borough Councils to ensure that a coherent, sustainable plan is generated.	None stated.	The Council has engaged with Guildford Borough Council, and other neighbouring authorities, through this consultation and in line with the (nationally set) Duty to Cooperate. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraph 6.2. The Council also meets regularly with Guildford to discuss strategic issues, and is similarly involved in inputting in Guildford's Local Plan proposals. As such, as also in liaison with the County Council, it is considered that coherent, sustainable plans are being developed between and within Woking and Guildford Boroughs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB12	Housing should be built to meet the need of the expanding elderly population, who are prevented from downsizing and so releasing large family homes due to the lack of suitable smaller properties. There is also a need for starter homes and affordable housing, to attract younger families and individuals to the village. These are not the types of houses planned at the proposed sites.	Plan for: - smaller properties that meet the needs of the growing elderly population who want to downsize; - starter homes -affordable housing. Both of the latter to attract younger families and individuals to the village.	These points are noted. The site would be required to provide affordable housing in line with the Council's requirements, in order to address local need. At present, the Council's requirement is set out in Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, but would be in accordance to the Council's plan at the time of planning permission, noting that this site is safeguarded for potential development after 2027. With regard to housing for older people wanting to downsize, the development would be expected to provide a mix of housing (currently outlined in Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy) and would be likely to provide housing suitable for downsizing. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy provides support for this type of housing. All new housing would be required to meet relevant accessibility standards (currently outlined in Policy CS21). In addition, the draft Site Allocations document puts forward sites specifically to cater to the needs of older people (site GB4 -land south of High St, Byfleet) although this in no means precludes the other allocated sites providing this type of housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
456	Richard	Ley	GB13	Housing should be built to meet the need of the expanding elderly population, who are prevented from downsizing and so releasing large family homes due to the lack of suitable smaller properties. There is also a need for starter homes and affordable housing, to attract younger families and individuals to the village. These are not the types of houses planned at the proposed sites.	Plan for: - smaller properties that meet the needs of the growing elderly population who want to downsize; - starter homes -affordable housing. Both of the latter to attract younger families and individuals to the village.	These points are noted. The site would be required to provide affordable housing in line with the Council's requirements, in order to address local need. At present, the Council's requirement is set out in Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, but would be in accordance to the Council's plan at the time of planning permission, noting that this site is safeguarded for potential development after 2027. With regard to housing for older people wanting to downsize, the development would be expected to provide a mix of housing (currently outlined in Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy) and would be likely to provide housing suitable for downsizing. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy provides support for this type of housing. All new housing would be required to meet relevant accessibility standards (currently outlined in Policy CS21). In addition, the draft Site Allocations document puts forward sites specifically to cater to the needs of older people (site GB4 -land south of High St, Byfleet) although this in no means precludes the other allocated sites providing this type of housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
385	Jacqueline	Light	GB8	Object to the proposals for a school, there is insufficient need in this area, most children will come from elsewhere. There are alternative sites	Consider alternative sites for the proposed school.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egleby Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
385	Jacqueline	Light	GB8	Object to the proposed release of GB land at Egleby Road, all the ventures can be built whilst retaining the GB status. This will ensure a gap can be retained between Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, and Section 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
385	Jacqueline	Light	GB8	Object to the leisure centre as there is one close by and the running track will create noise and visual disturbance in this tranquil area	None stated.	The planning application has been determined and permission granted. Issues relating to noise and amenity were considered as part of the proposal. The Committee report for the proposal is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
385	Jacqueline	Light	GB8	Object to the release of GB land in Mayford....believes that the projects will go ahead no matter the views of residents	None stated.	The objection is noted. The Council will consider the issues raised during the public consultation period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
385	Jacqueline	Light	GB8	It seems more sensible to make decisions to remove sites from the GB after 2027 at the appropriate time closer to 2027. Proposal for GB8 will only deliver 188 houses from the target, this could be accommodated elsewhere	Consider alternative sites for the 188 houses proposed for GB8	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.6. GB8 is being proposed to meet the housing need between 2022-2027	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Support the scoring of triple double minuses for this site.	None stated.	Support noted. The 'comments' column provides a comprehensive explanation for the scoring against this SA objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Queries the time it supposedly takes to drive to the Town Centre.	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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Reduce the causes of climate change - OK	None stated.	Noted. The 'comments' column provides a comprehensive explanation for the scoring against this SA objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Objective 12 should be scored as tripple zero. Unlikely that a significant proportion of building materials can be locally sourced	None stated.	The Council can also ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any development is minimised through careful design and by applying sustainable construction techniques. The SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Ok	None stated.	Noted. This is a detailed matter that will be addressed in the planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Ok	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Object to comments about the Neighbourhood Centre. There is no supporting infrastructure at the local centre apart from a barbers and a Post Office. The bus service is poor. The cycle route is inadequate. Stop misleading readers. The score should be triple negative	None stated.	The comments are appreciated, however it is important to note that proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres, and it is appreciated that they may not always exactly reflect real life conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations and the assessment is consistent with other site assessments. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Objective 16 would receive a positive score for the proposed school regardless of the site.	None stated.	The proposed allocation includes the provision of a school. It is considered reasonable to conclude that a new school would provide opportunities of employment and education.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Objective 17 would receive a positive score for the proposed houses regardless of the site.	None stated.	A site's proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres and therefore the sustainability. The SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Objective 2 would be positive for any proposal for a leisure centre regardless of the site	None stated.	There is no reference to a leisure centre and running track in the 'comments' column for the SA of this site. The positive score has been explained as being down to it being able to provide decent homes for the community, it being walking distance of nearby green spaces such as Smarts Heath and Prey Heath, and Hoe Stream footpaths. It's close proximity to local shops in Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which encourages walking and cycling.	No further modification is 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 SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites. You will note that regardless of a 'leisure centre', other proposal sites have scored equally. Therefore the Council does not believe the weighting applied is in anyway biased	
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	It is unlikely anyone would walk to Woking Station and the route to Worplesdon Station is dangerous.	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 pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	No one would walk to the doctors from Egley Road	None stated.	Noted, however 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 3 is awarded three zeros when it should be three minuses. The A320 currently floods and the new proposals will exasperate problems.	None stated.	<p>The site is wholly within the Flood Zone 1, the neutral score reflects. The objective has been assessed consistently for other sites.</p> <p>The eastern boundary is adjacent to land classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3, which has been noted.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 4 is awarded three pluses. Does not understand the logic of this given the existing and proposed use. The concern is that crime will actually increase as a result.	None stated.	<p>Assessments require a balanced judgement to be made based on the available evidence. The positive score is because the SA objective considers whether proposal would reduce crime, improve social inclusion, provide infrastructure to the community. A comprehensive explanation of how the site contributes positively to this objective is set out in the 'comment' column.</p> <p>The proposal comprises housing and a mix of uses, including a school that will provide additional/improved infrastructure will assist in supporting communities. The opportunity for recreation and open space will also result in positive outcomes that will assist in supporting the community.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 5 is misleading as it seeks to achieve a positive score regardless	None stated.	Noted, however the Council does not consider the comments to be misleading and has not proposed any modification to it.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 6 should receive a triple negative score as it will result in the loss of green field land.	None stated.	Greenfield sites have been consistently scored equally on this objective, this provides a consistent baseline in calculating the sustainability of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 7 should be three double minuses, the development proposal will be a huge pollutant in comparison to what exists at present. The proposed measures are unlikely to have significant effects to mitigate against the quantum of the development.	None stated.	The 'comments' column provides a comprehensive explanation for the scoring of the objective. Consideration has been given to the potential air, noise and light pollution that may result from the site coming forward, hence a negative score is attributed for the short term period 0-5 years.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 8 is an ambiguous statement and therefore the scoring is not convincing	None stated.	<p>The 'comments' column provides a comprehensive explanation for the scoring of the objective. The site coming forward does not impact on high quality agricultural land and would also allow the opportunity to remediate potential contamination on the site.</p> <p>The SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Objective 9. The proposal will devastate the habitats in this area and it is therefore hard to justify anything other than tripple negative. It is insufficient to separate Mayford and Woking with just a road verge and making contributions to SANGs elsewhere . It is hard to reconcile and preserve the integrity of the escarpment with the favouring of building to the north of the site.	None stated.	<p>The 'comments' column provides a comprehensive explanation for the scoring of the objective. Although the site is an extensive area of greenfield land, there are no ecological designations on the site.</p> <p>The Council can also ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any development is minimised through careful design.</p> <p>The SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The bus service along Egley Road is infrequent.	None stated.	<p>This is noted, however this is a factual statement</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Flooding will have an negative impact	None stated.	The site is wholly within the Flood Zone 1, the neutral score reflects. The objective has been assessed consistently for other sites. The eastern boundary is adjacent to land classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3, which has been noted. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Air Quality Assessment should be essential not 'recommended'	None stated.	The Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Suggests that any floodlighting should be switched off at 9pm	None stated.	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including any potential impact on local amenity including through light pollution and operating hours of the proposal. This is covered in the Officer report, paragraph 100, this is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The Archaeological investigation should be proper investigations and not just desk top reports	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Disappointed by the proposals. The options/decisions appear to have been manipulated. Parts of the Council seem intent on expand Woking significantly by building high density tower blocks and facilitating urban sprawl by abolishing the GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Object to proposals on the basis of all the constraints of the site and the potential impacts e.g. Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, impact on Trees and ecology, Archaeological Sites, coalescence, Preservation of Escarpment. Believes that developers will commission evidence in support of sites that will justify mitigation measures can be applied.	None stated.	It is correct, most planning applications are submitted with relevant technical reports to support the proposal. Technical reports will be commissioned and undertaken by relevant specialists to meet the requirements set out in the Development Plan. Case officers will review and scrutinise the evidence submitted, including seeking advice on matters that may not be clear, before they issue a recommendation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	In relation to environmentally sensitive sites and the need to retain their integrity means not building or obscuring them in any way.	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. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						landscape features. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The walk to Worplesdon Station is fairly long and very dangerous. There are no pavements and the road is a busy rat run. There is no immediate solution obvious to me.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Disagrees with the statement about the Neighbourhood Centre. There is no supporting infrastructure at the local centre apart from a barbers and a Post Office and even residents who live close by drive in.	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 and may place a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. However a site's proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres and therefore the sustainability of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Considers that a transport assessment and travel plan would reveal significant traffic problems with little in form of enhancements.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0 As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access, improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Supports the acknowledgement of consideration of site's location on a minor and major aquifer and potential affect on water quality. Looks forward to seeing the results on this	None stated.	Noted. The Key Requirements of the proposal require consideration of historic contaminative uses and the potential impact of development on the site, requiring consultation with the Environment Agency and Environmental Health. In addition, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The contributions that will be sought towards SANG/SAMM are of little comfort.	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Recycling and waste bins should be suitably sited	None stated.	This will be in accordance with Development Plan policies and guidance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Comments about wastewater and sewerage are obvious	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	What is 'natural surveillance'? Does not want to be part of this.	None stated.	This is referring to urban design principles/terminology. Designing in natural surveillance means to carefully consider the layout of properties and their proposed use, and to maximise the natural surveillance on the street by ensuring that windows/doors, elevations in active use, face the street scene. Hence, natural surveillance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The suggestion of a buffer against the noise impacts of the road and railway line are unnecessary. This has never been a concern	None stated.	The necessity for a buffer will be determined by a Noise Impact Assessment, as required in the key requirements for the proposal. The planning application has been determined and permission granted. Issues relating to noise and amenity were considered as part of the proposal. The Committee report for the proposal is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Ironic that the proposal would receive a positive score because of the historic contamination of the site.	None stated.	Evidence suggests there is potential contamination on present on the site. This is a factual statement	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Supports the acknowledgement of potential impact to the landscape character and the function of the site to separate the settlements	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	No further modification is 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>defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The bus service along Egley Road is infrequent.	None stated.	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The comment is seeking for positive outcome by suggesting improvements pedestrian and cycle links. People rarely walk to the centre.	None stated.	The comment reaffirms the proximity of the site to local services and facilities, and therefore provides a consistent baseline in assessing the sustainability of the site and the potential positive travel options available to access services and facilities. The objective has been assessed consistently for other sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Support comment that proposals will lead to exposure to noise, air and light pollution;	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The SA should be objectively reviewed and amendments made if necessary	None stated.	The Council will review the comments received at the Regulation 18 consultation and make relevant amendments to the Sustainability Appraisal where appropriate	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The Hook Heath Escarpment should be preserved and any development be in keeping with the area. It is unlikely that proposals will achieve this given the high cost of the area and the need to provide affordable housing	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The HRA is meaningless in the absence of an accurate traffic assessment. It is suggested that an executive summary could highlight the important conclusions concerning the various sites and their	None stated.	The objective of the HRA was to identify any aspects of the emerging DP that would cause a likely significant effect on Natura 2000 sites, also known as European sites (Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar sites), in isolation or in combination with other plans and projects. If such effects were identified, the purpose 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
				reliability in the opinion of the report's authors.		report was to identify appropriate mitigation strategies. The Council is confident that the HRA has been carried out comprehensively. However it will take into account representations at regulation 18 consultation if anything needs amending.	
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The draft SA is appear biased. Objective 1 would be positive for any proposal for housing regardless of the site	None stated.	This SA objective has been assessed consistently for other sites, therefore the Council does not see any particular bias for this site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The impact on the existing transport infrastructure has not been properly researched. Suspects this because of what it would reveal.	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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The proposals will only improve access to Barnsbury Primary School.	None stated.	To highlight improved accessibility to key services and facilities is a reasonable statement. The Council does not think this can be misinterpreted in the way that the representation has suggested.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The site should be left GB so that it can provide a gap between Woking and Mayford. The true impact of the School, Athletics Track and Leisure Centre can be assessed, with the option of expansion of the playing fields and school in the future.	None stated.	It is important to note, the proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Woking has taken a larger share of Surrey's housing need. This has created a situation where one bit of GB is being sacrificed in favour for the rest.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Disagree that the proposal would reduce reliance on private car use, and support the use of public transport. Asks how?	None stated.	The available evidence from the SA assessment and other evidence base suggests the sites proposed for allocation are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	The Council has already spent a large sum of taxpayers money on the site.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for the school and leisure centre. The Committee report which sets out the assessment of the proposal and decision is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
				There is mixed support for the development proposals, with generally more support for the school, however this is mainly from people who will not be adversely affected.			
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Despite best efforts, it is likely that most people will be travelling to and from the site by car	None stated.	The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christoph er	Light	GB8	Reiterates that there is limited facilities at the local centre and the suggested improvements to pedestrian links are	None stated.	The 'optimising/mitigating measures' part of the commentary makes observations on what mitigation measures could be applied. These are not taken into account in the weighting of the objectives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				unrealistic based on the road infrastructure			of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Object to the overall conclusions. Housing/affordable housing is not needed in the area	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Considers that local residents will suffer from more traffic and more pollution	None stated.	This is considered under SA objective 4. In addition, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The proposals are destroying green fields and requiring people to drive elsewhere for new ones.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Can the Council require the landowner to remediate the existing land contamination without the need to develop the site.	None stated.	Addressing contamination is not a Planning function. Land contamination is a constraint to the redevelopment of sites therefore it becomes a consideration in determining applications for sites that may be contaminated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Development proposals will improve proximity to schools but questions what other key services	None stated.	This is a factual statement of the proximity of the site to schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The statement regarding provision of open space and GI needs to be clarified. Where will this be provided?	None stated.	The exact nature of these measures will be informed by landscape assessment, ecological survey and tree survey at the planning application stage. Further advice can be sought in the Council's Natural Woking Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Support comment to retain protected tree belts and improve landscaping to enhance sense of separation between the two settlements.	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The contributions for essential transport will never be enough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	There is a lack of services/facilities at Mayford Neighbourhood Centre.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The Council does not consider the comments to be unreasonable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Local services/facilities are already fully supported and utilised, the new development is not needed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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(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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Previous efforts by the Council to reduce flooding have been unsuccessful.	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 has been successful in reducing flooding in the Borough, for example the Hoe Valley FAS.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Does not consider the site to be a sustainable location. There are limited facilities at the Neighbourhood Centre and the bus service is limited. The report is misleading	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The GBBR provides three alternatives for bringing forward sites in the GB. Object to any development in the GB. Would prefer brown field sites be identified as this would cause the least disturbance to the borough's residence. Suspects ulterior motives for bringing forward the Egley Road site and the supporting evidence which suggests this is the most sustainable site. A critique of SA has been provided to demonstrate the clear bias in the document.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	There is no justification to review the GB beyond 2027-2040. This decision should be taken by Councillors that are elected at the time.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The GB objective to retain a gap between Woking and Mayford cannot be credibly achieved simply by keeping a grass verge and the back land field to the South of the site clear.	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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The GBBR does not appear to be entirely independent. The Review simply proposes the easiest sites put forward by developers without fully investigating ways the GB could be preserved or enhanced or garden city development could be considered as an alternative approach	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	There is a lack of services/facilities at Mayford Neighbourhood Centre.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Disagrees that the site is within walking distance of green spaces such as Smarts Heath and Prey Heath, and Hoe Stream (Objective 2)- considers it to be a long walk from the north of the site	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
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Objects to the comment: The site offers good accessibility to most local facilities, and should ensure emissions from private car use do not significantly increase as a result of the development. This is not accurate, in reality, traffic will in fact increase significantly. The score should be amended to triple negatives.	None stated.	The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	For development proposals to be in keeping with the area. Development proposals need to be lower than the 40dph	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The Site Allocation DPD is an important issue, however the Council has chosen to allow for the minimum consultation period. Where respondees will be distracted by the separate Egley Road application	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. It is not unusual for development proposals to come forward in advance of the finalisation of the Site Allocation DPD. The processes are not mutually exclusive.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The site identification process should be clear and transparent. If need be, it should be examined by an independent authority.	None stated.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	There has not been a proper independently produced Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to date. What has been produced has been described as woefully inadequate	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 the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Suspects that the feasibility study for connection to the CHP network will reveal that it is not feasible.	None stated.	<p>This will be undertaken at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The inclusion of sustainable energy source was considered and addressed as part of the planning application. The Officer's Report for the application is available to view online.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The statement regarding a feasibility study is not considered to be substantive	None stated.	<p>This will be undertaken at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The inclusion of sustainable energy source was considered and addressed as part of the planning application. The Officer's Report for the application is available to view online.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	The cycle route/footpath along the canal are rarely used.	None stated.	This is noted, however this is a factual statement	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
396	Christopher	Light	GB8	Yes	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
412	Diana	Lindsay	GB15	Object. The local infrastructure will not be able to sustain the additional growth. Including roads, schools and medical facilities.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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</p>	No further modification is 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 Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
412	Diana	Lindsay	GB15	Object. The GB is important to wildlife, with a wonderful selection of unusual birds and animals (listed). Please do not build on the site. Allocate sensibly and evenly throughout the borough.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The 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
412	Diana	Lindsay	GB15	Concerned about infrastructure provision. There is no infrastructure in place to accommodate the growth. The commissioned GBBR stipulated that the site should not be developed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 10.0, Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
412	Diana	Lindsay	GB15	There are brownfield sites that should be explored. This will enhance the character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB8	I object to the proposal for housing on this sites for the following reasons: 1. Infrastructure in the area is under pressure. This is most evident in transport: roads are at capacity, the smallest incident lea to severe congestion, cycling is only for the brave, trains during the rush hour (and increasingly non-peak) are full and the objective of many commuters when getting on at Woking is to find a good place to stand!	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB9	I object to the proposal for housing on this sites for the following reasons: 1. Infrastructure in the area is under pressure. This is most evident in transport: roads are at	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site 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
				capacity, the smallest incident lead to severe congestion, cycling is only for the brave, trains during the rush hour (and increasingly non-peak) are full and the objective of many commuters when getting on at Woking is to find a good place to stand!		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.	
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB10	I object to the proposal for housing on this sites for the following reasons: 1. Infrastructure in the area is under pressure. This is most evident in transport: roads are at capacity, the smallest incident lead to severe congestion, cycling is only for the brave, trains during the rush hour (and increasingly non-peak) are full and the objective of many commuters when getting on at Woking is to find a good place to stand!	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB11	I object to the proposal for housing on this sites for the following reasons: 1. Infrastructure in the area is under pressure. This is most evident in transport: roads are at capacity, the smallest incident lead to severe congestion, cycling is only for the brave, trains during the rush hour (and increasingly non-peak) are full and the objective of many commuters when getting on at Woking is to find a good place to stand!	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB8	2. Impact on Local conservation areas: the sites identified to the west of the Woking – Guildford railway line border the Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance. Building on these sites will impact these important areas. All sites will have an adverse impact on nearby Prey Heath and Smarts Heath.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB9	2. Impact on Local conservation areas: the sites identified to the west of the Woking – Guildford railway line border the Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance. Building on these sites will impact these important areas. All sites will have an adverse impact on nearby Prey Heath and Smarts Heath.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB10	2. Impact on Local conservation areas: the sites identified to the west of the Woking – Guildford railway line border the Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance. Building on these sites will impact these important areas. All sites will have an adverse impact on nearby Prey Heath and Smarts Heath.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB11	2. Impact on Local conservation areas: the sites identified to the west of the Woking – Guildford railway line border the Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance. Building on these sites will impact these important areas. All sites will have an adverse impact on nearby Prey Heath and Smarts Heath.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB8	3. Loss of amenity land: Developing these sites will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall landscape character of the area. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The specific character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB9	3. Loss of amenity land: Developing these sites will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall landscape character of the area. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The specific character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB10	3. Loss of amenity land: Developing these sites will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall landscape character of the area. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The specific character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB11	3. Loss of amenity land: Developing these sites will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall landscape character of the area. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The specific character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB8	4. Density: Proposed development density is 30 dwellings per hectare, 3 times the existing density in Mayford. Any development should reflect existing density.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB9	4. Density: Proposed development density is 30 dwellings per hectare, 3 times the existing density in Mayford. Any development should reflect existing density.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB10	4. Density: Proposed development density is 30 dwellings per hectare, 3 times the existing density in Mayford. Any development should reflect existing density.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB11	4. Density: Proposed development density is 30 dwellings per hectare, 3 times the existing density in Mayford. Any development should reflect existing density.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
17	Pieter	Litjens	GB7	Object to this proposal. There are existing travellers sites at Brookwood, Burdenshott Rd (expanded greatly over the recent years) and 10 Acre Farm, all within or a short distance from Mayford. There is no justification for additional provision in Mayford. If there is no legal obligation to provide more sites then suggest keeping provision at its current level. If there is a legal obligation, please find alternative sites in the Borough. Additional provision at 10 Acre Farm will have an adverse impact on the neighbouring Smarts Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB8	Sites that border Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance will have an impact on these important sites. Development will impact Prey Heath and Smarts Heath heathland.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation will apply.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB9	Sites that border Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance will have an impact on these important sites. Development will impact Prey Heath and Smarts Heath heathland.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation will apply.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB10	Sites that border Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance will have an impact on these important sites. Development will impact Prey Heath and Smarts Heath heathland.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation will apply.	
860	Eva	Litjens	GB11	Sites that border Fishers Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath Escarpment area of landscape importance will have an impact on these important sites. Development will impact Prey Heath and Smarts Heath heathland.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation will apply.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB8	Loss of amenity land: Developing the sites identified will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB9	Loss of amenity land: Developing the sites identified will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB10	Loss of amenity land: Developing the sites identified will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB11	Loss of amenity land: Developing the sites identified will fill the green space between Hook Heath and Mayford, and result in the loss of open space that is enjoyed by many.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB8	Proposed development density is 30 dph - 3 times the existing Mayford density. Development should reflect the existing density.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB9	Proposed development density is 30 dph - 3 times the existing Mayford density. Development should reflect the existing density.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB10	Proposed development density is 30 dph - 3 times the existing Mayford density. Development should reflect the existing density.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB11	Proposed development density is 30 dph - 3 times the existing Mayford density. Development should reflect the existing density.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB7	Will impact neighbouring Smarts Heath SSSI.	If there is a legal obligation to provide more pitches then please find alternative sites in the borough.	<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.</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
860	Eva	Litjens	GB8	Infrastructure under pressure, especially transport. Roads at capacity and small incidents result in severe congestion. Cycling is only for the brave. Trains are full.	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>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
860	Eva	Litjens	GB9	Infrastructure under pressure, especially transport. Roads at capacity and small incidents result in severe congestion. Cycling is only for the brave. Trains are full.	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>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB10	Infrastructure under pressure, especially transport. Roads at capacity and small incidents result in severe congestion. Cycling is only for the brave. Trains are full.	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>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB11	Infrastructure under pressure, especially transport. Roads at capacity and small incidents result in severe congestion. Cycling is only for the brave. Trains are full.	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>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
860	Eva	Litjens	GB7	Already existing traveller sites in the area, no justification for additional provision. Brookwood site has already been expanded over recent years. If there is no legal obligation to provide more sites then keep provision at its current level, otherwise alternative sites should be found in the borough.	If there is a legal obligation to provide more pitches then please find alternative sites in the borough.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB7	There are limited services within Mayford.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB8	There are no local services in the area.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB9	There are no local services in the area.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB10	There are no local services in the area.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB11	There are no local services in the area.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB14	There are no local services in the area.	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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB7	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB8	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB9	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB10	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer</p>	No further modification is 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>contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB11	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB14	Strongly object. The infrastructure in the local area is not suitable for large scale developments. The roads are at capacity as is Worplesdon Station and car park. There are also no trains on Sundays or Bank Holidays.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The impact of the proposed site allocations on the road network has been addressed, in particular, in paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations as well as the frequency of the services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB10	Strongly object. The roads are not suitable for large scale developments. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB11	Strongly object. The roads are not suitable for large scale developments. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>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
1607	John, Jenny	Lock	GB14	Strongly object. The roads are not suitable for large scale developments. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>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
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Local infrastructure is already stretched (nurseries, infant and junior schools, shops, dentists and doctors). There will be a negative knock-on affect to villagers as additional housing will bring additional requirements. Additional 800-1600 people to the village is ludicrous.	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	Local infrastructure is already stretched (nurseries, infant and junior schools, shops, dentists and doctors). There will be a negative knock-on affect to villagers as additional housing will bring additional requirements. Additional 800-1600 people to the village is ludicrous.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village, it could erode the rural setting of the village. There are various important historic assets, which could be adversely impacted including their landscape setting: Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings).	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The landscape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposal is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and options Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				I fully oppose the planned application for housing, in view of my children, their schooling, our elderly relatives, retired villagers, increase in traffic and constraints on doctor, dental and shopping facilities for our villagers.			
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	<p>Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village, it could erode the rural setting of the village. There are various important historic assets, which could be adversely impacted including their landscape setting: Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings).</p> <p>I fully oppose the planned application for housing, in view of my children, their schooling, our elderly relatives, retired villagers, increase in traffic and constraints on doctor, dental and shopping facilities for our villagers.</p>	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Concern for landscape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive landscape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fields form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	Concern for landscape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive landscape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fields form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Objection to planning in Green Belt and farmland. Please keep Pyrford a village. Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed. The significant increase in cars would not be sustainable given the current road infrastructure of the village.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined by the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1151	Kate	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	Objection to planning in Green Belt and farmland. Please keep Pyrford a village. Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed. The significant increase in cars would not be sustainable given the current road infrastructure of the village.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the site can be development without significantly undermining the overall character of the area. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. It is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly impact on wildlife in the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	<p>The DPD is in part based on the Green Belt Review, which is flawed. Particularly GB12 and GB13 which consistently assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes (poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity). Much of the Green Belt Review evidence undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion. GB13 was considered particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the Site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' and unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The Review sieves out sites including GB12 and GB13, then reintroduces GB12 back in at the end of the process without justification, based on land availability. Availability is not a criteria in the methodology; a fundamental flaw. There are several alternative sites that performed better in suitability and/or sustainability terms (Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28). The sites have not all been subject to an equal consistent assessment; some broken down into 'sub-parcels' for more refined appraisal, others not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining areas suitable for release.</p> <p>While Woking is not an 'historic town', historic assets should still be assessed, along with setting. The Green Belt Review does not do this; it neglects to consider important historic assets in the Borough.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	The DPD is in part based on the Green Belt Review, which is flawed. Particularly GB12 and GB13 which consistently	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions.	No further modification is 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>assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes (poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity). Much of the Green Belt Review evidence undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion. GB13 was considered particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the Site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' and unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The Review sieves out sites including GB12 and GB13, then reintroduces GB12 back in at the end of the process without justification, based on land availability. Availability is not a criteria in the methodology; a fundamental flaw. There are several alternative sites that performed better in suitability and/or sustainability terms (Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28). The sites have not all been subject to an equal consistent assessment; some broken down into 'sub-parcels' for more refined appraisal, others not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining areas suitable for release.</p> <p>While Woking is not an 'historic town', historic assets should still be assessed, along with setting. The Green Belt Review does not do this; it neglects to consider important historic assets in the Borough.</p>		<p>The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	<p>Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development, surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village it could erode the rural setting of the village. Development would adversely impact Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings), Grade II listed buildings; Pyrford Area, surrounding agricultural landscape and farms part of its setting (listed Wheelers Farm and Barn, building at Key Lees).</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	<p>Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development, surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village it could erode the rural setting of the village. Development would adversely impact Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings), Grade II listed buildings; Pyrford Area, surrounding agricultural landscape and farms part of its setting (listed Wheelers Farm and Barn, building at Key Lees).</p>	None stated.	<p>The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	<p>I object to the two Green Belt locations. This additional housing and population would make Pyrford a TOWN and not a village. Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet</p>	No further modification is 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 projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined by the proposals. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	I object to the two Green Belt locations. This additional housing and population would make Pyrford a TOWN and not a village. Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the site can be development without significantly undermining the overall character of the area. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport 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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly impact on wildlife in the area. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</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
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Concern for landscape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive landscape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fields form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village.	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	Concern for landscape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley,	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and</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
				with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive landscape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fields form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong landscape context for the village.		Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	Local infrastructure is already stretched (nurseries, infant and junior schools, shops, dentists and doctors). Additional 800-1600 people to the village is ludicrous. There will be a negative knock-on affect to villagers as already served by these over subscribed 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
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	Local infrastructure is already stretched (nurseries, infant and junior schools, shops, dentists and doctors). Additional 800-1600 people to the village is ludicrous. There will be a negative knock-on affect to villagers as already served by these over subscribed 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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB12	The Council is satisfied that the draft DPD follows the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review recommendations for the most sustainable pattern of development. However there are conflicts between their conclusions: GB13 was not considered suitable by the Review but is a “preferred site” in the SA. The Council considered the Review identified too few sites to meet the 2040 housing land supply targets so included GB13 as a safeguarded site based on the SA, contrary to the Review. The DPD alternates between the Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process, which is inconsistent.	None stated.	Site GB12 was recommended for release in the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council has used a range of evidence such as the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the Site Allocations DPD. They collectively support the allocation of site GB13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1167	Stuart	Lockwood-Cowell	GB13	The Council is satisfied that the draft DPD follows the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review recommendations for the most sustainable pattern of development. However there are conflicts between their conclusions: GB13 was not considered suitable by the Review but is a “preferred site” in the SA. The Council considered the Review identified too few sites to meet the 2040 housing land supply targets so included GB13 as a safeguarded site based on the SA, contrary to the Review. The DPD alternates between the Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process, which is inconsistent.	None stated.	There are conflicts in the Council's decisions in the selection of preferred site. The reasons why sites are selected or rejected are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD and collectively they justify the allocation of the proposals. The evidence used to support the DPD is highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	There is 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	There is 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	There is 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	There is 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB7	Development in the area will threaten wildlife on Smarts Heath SSSI. The area is also an important open space. The intensification of use on the site will have an impact on wildlife and visual amenity of the area	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB7	Concerned that the proposed business use would pose a nuisance including fumes, noise	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting in light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise, soil and groundwater contamination. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0 particularly paragraph 4.12</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Policy clearly states “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done on 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Policy clearly states “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done on 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Policy clearly states “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done on 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Policy clearly states “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done on 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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.	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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.	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.	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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.	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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.	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB7	Proposals will result in additional traffic	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and</p>	No further modification is 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>enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the</p>	No further modification is 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>recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Development in the area will wipe out the wildlife on protected heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). The SPA and buffer were excluded from consideration in the GBBR. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SSSIs (and buffer) should also be excluded from consideration	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	Development in the area will wipe out the wildlife on protected heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). The SPA and buffer were excluded from consideration in the GBBR. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SSSIs (and buffer) should also be excluded from consideration	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	Development in the area will wipe out the wildlife on protected heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). The SPA and buffer were excluded from consideration in the GBBR. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SSSIs (and buffer) should also be excluded from consideration	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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	Development in the area will wipe out the wildlife on protected heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). The SPA and buffer were excluded from consideration in the GBBR. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath as SSSIs (and buffer) should also be excluded from consideration	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	There is a poor road network through the village. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	There is a poor road network through the village. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	There is a poor road network through the village. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	There is a poor road network through the village. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	No evidence provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	No evidence provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	No evidence provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	No evidence provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB7	Mayford resident. Object to GB7. Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough. Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community. There's no justification for expansion	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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 and mentioned in the Domesday Book	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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 and mentioned in the Domesday Book	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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 and mentioned in the Domesday Book	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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 and mentioned in the Domesday Book	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Disagrees that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area and speculates that it would be a precursor to housing on adjoining fields later on	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	Disagrees that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area and speculates that it would be a precursor to housing on adjoining fields later on	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	Disagrees that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area and speculates that it would be a precursor to housing on adjoining fields later on	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	Disagrees that the school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area and speculates that it would be a precursor to housing on adjoining fields later on	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	<p>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.</p> <p>There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. The GBBR is flawed</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	<p>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.</p> <p>There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. The GBBR is flawed</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	<p>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.</p> <p>There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. The GBBR is flawed</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. The GBBR is flawed		<p>Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						and the creation of linkages between sites to create a 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.	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	There are three single lane bridges, where there is currently heavy traffic and congestion. The noise and fumes are unbearable in the area	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	There are three single lane bridges, where there is currently heavy traffic and congestion. The noise and fumes are unbearable in the area	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	There are three single lane bridges, where there is currently heavy traffic and congestion. The noise and fumes are unbearable in the area	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 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 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	There are three single lane bridges, where there is currently heavy traffic and congestion. The noise and fumes are unbearable in the area	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 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 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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools, shops, employment and other local facilities. The site does not meet the criteria	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths .	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths .	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths .	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
1358	Roy, Pam	Lomax	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths .	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
460	D G	Long	GB12	I SAY NO TO THE PROPOSED UPSHOTT LANE DEVELOPMENT ON Green Belt LAND IN PYRFORD because the loss of the two Green Belt fields would be a massive blow to local residents and alternative, less controversial, less intrusive locations should be found.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	I SAY NO TO THE PROPOSED UPSHOTT LANE DEVELOPMENT ON Green Belt LAND IN PYRFORD because the loss of the two Green Belt fields would be a massive blow to local residents and alternative, less controversial, less intrusive locations should be found.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	Local shopping is available but Woking and West Byfleet main shopping centres are already crowded with little or no excess parking.	None stated.	The Council's approach to provision of local infrastructure is covered in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet local need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	Local shopping is available but Woking and West Byfleet main shopping centres are already crowded with little or no excess parking.	None stated.	The Council's approach to provision of local infrastructure is covered in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet local need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	There is little available parking and some is dangerous to pedestrians and drivers. School drop off times cause chaos.	None stated.	On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational	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
						characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the local need. The representation is further addressed in Section 3.0, 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	There is little available parking and some is dangerous to pedestrians and drivers. School drop off times cause chaos.	None stated.	On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the local need. The representation is further addressed in Section 3.0, 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	The value of existing properties would be adversely affected by the additional large 'estates'.	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site will result in a negative impact on local property values. The Council has a number of planning policies which will ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area. This includes CS21 of the Core Strategy as well as best practice guidance set out in the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	The value of existing properties would be adversely affected by the additional large 'estates'.	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site will result in a negative impact on local property values. The Council has a number of planning policies which will ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area. This includes CS21 of the Core Strategy as well as best practice guidance set out in the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	An increase in traffic from development would be dangerous and cause gridlock, further exacerbated by development proposed at Wisley Airfield. Road links are limited by their narrowness and cannot be readily improved.	None stated.	The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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
460	D G	Long	GB13	An increase in traffic from development would be dangerous and cause gridlock, further exacerbated by development proposed at Wisley Airfield. Road links are limited by their narrowness and cannot be readily improved.	None stated.	This representation 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
460	D G	Long	GB12	The primary school is at capacity and current development will only cater for the current additional requirement, not the further requirement of such large development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	The primary school is at capacity and current development will only cater for the current additional requirement, not the further requirement of such large development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	The addition of 400 houses would destroy the pleasant village atmosphere and way of life enjoyed by residents. The rural surroundings and easy access to the 'countryside' is a big attraction.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition, please refer to Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	The addition of 400 houses would destroy the pleasant village atmosphere and way of life enjoyed by residents. The rural surroundings and easy access to the 'countryside' is a big attraction.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition, please refer to Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
460	D G	Long	GB12	The area supports biodiversity, areas of scientific interest, historic buildings and a network of footpaths, which are valued by local inhabitants. Any detrimental effect would be unacceptable.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. 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). In addition, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0, on historic buildings and Sections 21.0 and 23.0 on well-being of residents and local character. The key requirements for the site also states 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	The area supports biodiversity, areas of scientific interest, historic buildings and a network of footpaths, which are valued by local inhabitants. Any detrimental effect would be unacceptable.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. 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). In addition, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0, on historic buildings and Sections 21.0 and 23.0 on well-being of residents and local character. The key requirements for the site also states 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	There are no medical facilities in Pyrford and those at West Byfleet are overstretched.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	There are no medical facilities in Pyrford and those at West Byfleet are overstretched.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	There are no services for the elderly and limited opportunities for young mothers and children.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB13	There are no services for the elderly and limited opportunities for young mothers and children.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
460	D G	Long	GB12	Transport: the bus service is minimal and Woking and West Byfleet station are overloaded at peak times. Parking at stations is already fully occupied.	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
460	D G	Long	GB13	Transport: the bus service is minimal and Woking and West Byfleet station are overloaded at peak times. Parking at stations is already fully occupied.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school and leisure centre will cause light pollution affecting the residents and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school and leisure centre will cause light pollution affecting the residents and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school and leisure centre will cause light pollution affecting the residents and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school and leisure centre will cause light pollution affecting the residents and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school and leisure centre will cause light pollution affecting the residents and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	Reconsider the plans. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	Reconsider the plans. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	Reconsider the plans. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	Reconsider the plans. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	Reconsider the plans. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some	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
						areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB7	Proposals will have a terrible impact on life in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	Will remove all green space between Mayford and Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	Will remove all green space between Mayford and Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	Will remove all green space between Mayford and Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	Will remove all green space between Mayford and Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	Will remove all green space between Mayford and Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1059	W	Longmuir	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on this site. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	Will no longer be a village but a suburb of Woking. Questions whether the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will also disappear.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	Will no longer be a village but a suburb of Woking. Questions whether the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will also disappear.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	Will no longer be a village but a suburb of Woking. Questions whether the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will also disappear.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	Will no longer be a village but a suburb of Woking. Questions whether the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will also disappear.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	Will no longer be a village but a suburb of Woking. Questions whether the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will also disappear.	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
1059	W	Longmuir	GB8	Questions why another leisure centre is needed when there is already one at Woking Park.	None stated.	Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB9	Questions why another leisure centre is needed when there is already one at Woking Park.	None stated.	Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB10	Questions why another leisure centre is needed when there is already one at Woking Park.	None stated.	Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB11	Questions why another leisure centre is needed when there is already one at Woking Park.	None stated.	Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1059	W	Longmuir	GB14	Questions why another leisure centre is needed when there is already one at Woking Park.	None stated.	Please note that planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1500	Linda	Lopez Calvete	5 Content of the Site Allocations DPD	Brookwood should not have to bear the environmental and social impact of increased traveller pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0. and 4.0, particularly paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1500	Linda	Lopez Calvete	GB3	GB2 already contains the maximum number of pitches, and GB3 is not a separate site. It is adjacent and an extension to it. As presented, these sites will merge. The village already has its share of travellers and should not be forced to take more. Suggests GB3 should be made an extension of GB1, for housing.	The area GB 3 should be made an extension of site GB1 and should be	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.8 and 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
					included for housing.		
1500	Linda	Lopez Calvete	Proposals map	GB2 already contains the maximum number of pitches, and GB3 is not a separate site. It is adjacent and an extension to it. As presented, these sites will merge. The village already has its share of travellers and should not be forced to take more. Suggests GB3 should be made an extension of GB1, for housing.	The area GB 3 should be made an extension of site GB1 and should be included for housing.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0 and 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1500	Linda	Lopez Calvete	GB2	GB2 already contains the maximum number of pitches, and GB3 is not a separate site. It is adjacent and an extension to it. As presented, these sites will merge. The village already has its share of travellers and should not be forced to take more. Suggests GB3 should be made an extension of GB1, for housing.	The area GB 3 should be made an extension of site GB1 and should be included for housing.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0 and 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1055	Sandra	Lott	GB16	Object to additional development in West Byfleet. Will put strain on the infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1055	Sandra	Lott	GB16	Green Belt land should not be built on.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1534	David	Lott	GB16	Object to development. This and other developments will put a strain on the local infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1534	David	Lott	GB16	Green Belt should be protected.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrating all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrating all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrating all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrating all brownfield sites have been exhausted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB7	Object to increasing pitches on site. A sequential approach should be taken to identifying sites, with urban sites considered before Green Belt sites. However as it appears no urban sites have been considered, the validity of no other sites across the borough being suitable is therefore questioned.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't proved this. National policy states that housing need is inappropriate	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
				development.			
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't proved this. National policy states that housing need is 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't proved this. National policy states that housing need is 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't proved this. National policy states that housing need is 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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,	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.		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.	
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	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. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB7	Traveller sites include space for related business activities which will be out of keeping for a residential road.	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
870	Nashida	Louafi-Hamdi-Cherif	GB7	Mayford does not satisfy the given criteria for edge of urban area sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	While the objective set out on page 752 is to provide affordable housing, this will not be the case as the price of housing in the proposed development will be much higher than present housing stock. This is despite development	None stated.	The Council has an Affordable Housing policy (Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy). The Council will make sure that the requirements of the policy is followed when any application comes forward for determination. Nevertheless, the Council is aware of the relatively high house prices in the area that is influenced by many other factors. This is the more reason why 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
				being of a far lower standard than present houses.		important that the Affordable Housing policy is followed.	
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	Restrict new development to the original plan (blue line) for Sheerwater -flats, shops and garages in Dartmouth Avenue, or refurbish and maintain the flats.	Restrict new development to the original plan (blue line) for Sheerwater -flats, shops and garages in Dartmouth Avenue, or refurbish and maintain the flats.	The Woking Core Strategy (2010-2027) states that Maybury and Sheerwater could accommodate around 250 additional homes. The proposed allocation reflects this by stating that 'it is anticipated that a high density mixed use development of the site could yield at least 250 net additional dwellings, retail and community floorspace'. Therefore the draft Site Allocations DPD is broadly similar to Core Strategy Policy CS5. Overall a comprehensive redevelopment of the site could best address the existing social and economic issues of the area. This would support the policy aims and objectives of the Core Strategy and in particular Policy CS5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	While the objective set on page 754 us to reduce vulnerability to flooding, flooding will increase dramatically as Sheerwater flood plains are built on. These act at present to safeguard the rest of Sheerwater.	2. Do not build on the flood plain	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	The objective set on page 755 is to reduce poverty, crime and social exclusion. Sheerwater already has one of the lowest crime rates in the Borough, only a small area (flats above the shops) is deprived and that is mainly due to NVH not repairing and maintaining the properties. Woking Council has place an unprecedentedly high proportion of people with 'problems' in the area, but these people have been included and accepted into the community.	None stated.	Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as part of the Priority Places where priority for investment will be needed to enhance and address pockets of deprivation in the area. The proposal will make a significant contribution towards this objective by addressing some of the underlying causes why the area has been identified as Priority Place. It is acknowledged that besides the regeneration schemes, there are other things that the Council is working with its partners to improve. This includes things such as the new link road, measure to improve jobs and support local businesses. Part of the regeneration is to balance the housing mix and tenure in the area to ensure the sustainable development of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	The objective set on page 757 is to make best use of previously developed land and existing buildings. The original 1950s houses built in Sheerwater were built to a very high standard and could be expected to provide excellent housing for another 60 years or more, as opposed to the proposed development which will last only another 30 years (NVH own admittance). This is not good use of council property.	4. Do not demolish the existing good quality housing in Sheerwater.	Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as part of the Priority Places where priority for investment will be needed to enhance and address pockets of deprivation in the area. The proposal will make a significant contribution towards this objective by addressing some of the underlying causes why the area has been identified as Priority Place. It is acknowledged that besides the regeneration schemes, there are other things that the Council is working with its partners to improve. This includes things such as the new link road, measure to improve jobs and support local businesses. Part of the regeneration is to balance the housing mix and tenure in the area to ensure the sustainable development of the area. It is acknowledged that a planning application has been submitted for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of about as twice as many new homes. This application will be determined on its merits in accordance with the policies of the development plan for the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
540	Joanne	Louca	UA32	Objects strongly to compulsory purchase of property in this area.	Do not use compulsory purchase.	Core Strategy Policy CS5 sets out the aspirations for the Borough's Priority Places which include Sheerwater. This policy has been prepared and adopted by the Council to tackle the existing pockets of deprivation within the existing community. As set out within paragraph 4.57 of the policy, the Council will use its CPO powers and other means to assist with site assembly where it is necessary to do so. Whilst the Council sympathises with the concern set out in the representation, any proposed redevelopment of the area will be required to demonstrate that it will significantly improve the area, address the issues of deprivation and contribute towards the aspirations set out in the policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	10. Impossible to screen the development from the Basingstoke canal conservation area; adverse impact of light and noise pollution.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and Dm7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	11. Nonsense to demolish perfectly good well built and maintained private homes then rebuild but with a greater density. This increases the known causes of climate change.	None stated.	Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy provides the strategic context for the regeneration of the Priority Places, including Sheerwater. The proposal will overall improve the general environment of the area. Together with other initiatives to improve economic and social activity in the area, it is expected that this will lead to a sustainable regeneration of the area. It is not expected that the scheme would have significant adverse effects on climate change. This is confirmed by the SA Report. It is highlighted that planning application has been submitted for the Sheerwater schemes. This is yet to be determined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	12. No provision for more allotment plots, contrary to a stated aim.	None stated.	Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy to enable contributions to be sought towards the provision of allotments.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	14. The Council has not investigated local water consumption. Meaningless to say this will decrease. No evidence.	None stated.	Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy introduces strict standards for water consumption. This is taken into account when determining planning applications.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	15. The development will increase travel by car. Public transport has been run down, car travel by default is encouraged. Bus shelters removed from Albert Drive. The elderly, disabled and those with young children are discriminated against. Complaints about this have fallen on deaf ears.	None stated.	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	16. The Asda supermarket was to increase local employment; only 1% of their workforce is from Sheerwater area. This development will be only a cash cow for New Vision Homes.	None stated.	The proposed allocation will assist in the regeneration of the area in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	2. Current health profile is good and above national average. The increased housing density and traffic will increase in heart, lung and respiratory disease.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	Development is likely to increase the risk of flooding to homes in Flood Zone 2 outside the site area. The original area defined in Core Strategy would not increase risk.	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	4. Sheerwater currently has one of the lowest crime rates in Woking. Deprivation centres on council owned flats. The Council is a slum landlord and has deliberately run down these areas over years. Believe there is a hidden agenda to poor maintenance. The Council aims to reduce the number of welfare claimants in Sheerwater by re-housing them prior to the rebuild. These people to be "decanted" are our friends, neighbours and relations. Nothing short of social cleansing.	None stated.	The justification for the regeneration of Sheerwater as a Priority Place has been established in the Core Strategy. The proposal is in accordance with that. See Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The Council has been transparent in preparing both the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD, and there is no hidden agenda as suggested.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	5. Our recreation area, playing field and athletics stadium will all go, to be replaced with expensive "box" housing and strips of green areas. The leisure centre will only be sustainable with large volume use, increasing traffic and parking problems, noise pollution, reduced air quality, a deterrent to wildlife along the canal. Slow worm and bat populations will not recover from habitat destruction.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. The key requirements of the proposal will ensure that noise and air quality implications are sufficiently dealt with. The traffic implications of the proposal is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	6. Increased housing density is foolish and will fail. The volume of car users will increase. The Sheerwater access road has increased traffic using Albert Drive, with resulting noise and pollution. Redevelopment will have long-term adverse health effects.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	7. The Council is aware it has made no attempt to develop AQMA's for the Sheerwater area, this is a deliberate policy. The development will not help improve air quality, noise levels or light pollution (including along the canal, from the	None stated.	The Council will develop an AQMA is it is justified to do so by evidence. Nevertheless, air quality is considered an important consideration in planning decision and the key requirements of the proposal will ensure that appropriate attention is given to this matter at the right time in the planning 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
				leisure centre, affecting hibernating wildlife in winter).			
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	Building homes on playing fields would require massive engineering works to mitigate the high water table, adversely impacting wildlife and Sheerwater residents in short and long term.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the proposals can be developed to achieve positive viability and ensure sustainable development. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	Core Strategy clearly shows a regeneration area (in blue) encompassing the deprived areas of Sheerwater. However UA32 goes far beyond, to include privately owned homes. These will be compulsory purchased. With reference to the sustainability appraisal objectives: 1. The term affordable is relative, there will be a shortfall between what a home owner will receive in CPO and what a new development home will cost, removing current residents from the "new" Sheerwater. Not regeneration, social cleansing.	None stated.	The proposed allocation provides a reasonable area for a comprehensive redevelopment that will have maximum benefits to the community. It is accepted that 'affordable' is relative depending on the housing market of the particular area. Nevertheless, within the context of Woking, the Council will ensure that development includes affordable housing in accordance with the requirements of the Core Strategy. Whilst CPO is always seen as a last option in any negotiation process, the Core Strategy supports its use to facilitate the delivery of schemes that benefits the local community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1122	Chris	Louca	UA32	Whole development is ill considered and will rip the heart out of the Sheerwater community. Current council tenants will be moved, current private home owners will suffer CPO and be unable to repurchase in the area. This is attempt by Woking Council to remove it obligation to maintain social housing and to change the demography of voters to those in line with the ruling party in Woking. The Council should revert to the original "blue area" plan in the Core Strategy, which the majority of residents agreed with. The Council should listen and represent not dictate!	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 to make sure that the application is determined in accordance with Policy CS5 and other relevant policies of the Local Plan. The consultation for the DPD is separate from that of the planning application. Regarding the DPD, there has been extensive public consultation including a visit to Sheerwater to distribute leaflets and speak to people in public. The general approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
726	Guy	Lovatt	General	Infrastructure needs to be developed before any further developments	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
726	Guy	Lovatt	Cumulative impacts	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
726	Guy	Lovatt	Conclusions	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
726	Guy	Lovatt	General	Objecting as the proposed area is on Green Belt land.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
726	Guy	Lovatt	General	The proposed sites are on flood plains.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
726	Guy	Lovatt	General	More housing will result in additional cars and rush hour is already bad. Parvis Road will be at a standstill.	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
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	Pyrford needs to be kept as it is as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become like generic suburbia.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	Pyrford needs to be kept as it is as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become like generic suburbia.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to where we live.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to where we live.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB12	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 19.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1508	Martin	Lovejoy	GB13	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	Pyrford needs to be kept as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become a town.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	Pyrford needs to be kept as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become a town.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to where we live.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to where we live.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB12	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1509	Barbara	Lovejoy	GB13	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	Objects to the proposals like many of my neighbours. When we moved to Pyrford in 1983 it was a real country village on the edge of open fields and woods. The local community was small and friendly.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	There are already water shortages in the summer. Questions how the addition of 400 new houses in the village would impact water supply?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	Pyrford needs to be kept as it is as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become like generic suburbia.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	Pyrford needs to be kept as it is as a village. Taking away more fields would mean it is not Pyrford as we know it. It would become like generic suburbia.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	More houses will mean more cars and add to existing congestion. It is not possible to build wider roads in Pyrford without destroying the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation 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 development proposed, including improvement to roads, will meet the Council's high standards of design and environmental protection, and are not expected to undermine the social, environmental or economic character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford for the existing population. New houses means more people with families in the area - questions how the school would manage. The proposed replacement teaching block is only sufficient for the present population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural	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
				where we live.		England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	We need to protect our local green fields to conserve wildlife, and to permit us to observe them in country walks close to where we live.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB12	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1510	Alex	Lovejoy	GB13	A previous development of a field off Pyrford Road has become a real life 'Legoland' with properties crowded together. It is hated by almost everyone in the village.	None stated.	Development will be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental, climate change and design requirements of the Core Strategy and the Design SPD. Local landscape and character will also be accounted for, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB4	Roads are gridlocked from 4pm - 6pm on weekdays in Byfleet and West Byfleet. This has been exacerbated by the introduction of traffic lights outside the Marist School.	None stated.	This representation 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
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB5	Roads are gridlocked from 4pm - 6pm on weekdays in Byfleet and West Byfleet. This has been exacerbated by the introduction of traffic lights outside the Marist School.	None stated.	This representation 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
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB15	Roads are gridlocked from 4pm - 6pm on weekdays in Byfleet and West Byfleet. This has been exacerbated by the introduction of traffic lights outside the Marist School.	None stated.	This representation 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
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB16	Roads are gridlocked from 4pm - 6pm on weekdays in Byfleet and West Byfleet. This has been exacerbated by the introduction of traffic lights outside the Marist School. The size of the school proposed at Broadoaks will substantially worsen traffic at morning and afternoon peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should also be noted that the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB4	Objects to the number of houses proposed on land released from Green Belt surrounding Byfleet and West Byfleet. There is a lack of infrastructure to support these houses, including roads and school spaces.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and specifically on school places, paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB5	Objects to the number of houses proposed on land released from Green Belt surrounding Byfleet and West Byfleet. There	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and specifically on school places, paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				is a lack of infrastructure to support these houses, including roads and school spaces.		the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB15	Objects to the number of houses proposed on land released from Green Belt surrounding Byfleet and West Byfleet. There is a lack of infrastructure to support these houses, including roads and school spaces.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and specifically on school places, paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB16	Objects to the number of houses proposed on land released from Green Belt surrounding Byfleet and West Byfleet. There is a lack of infrastructure to support these houses, including roads and school spaces.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and specifically on school places, paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB4	We would consider moving from the area if we cannot travel freely within it!	None stated.	Transport infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB5	We would consider moving from the area if we cannot travel freely within it!	None stated.	Transport infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB15	We would consider moving from the area if we cannot travel freely within it!	None stated.	Transport infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1493	Elizabeth	Lovelace	GB16	We would consider moving from the area if we cannot travel freely within it!	None stated.	Transport infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet is an island cut off by the M25, River Wey and railway line. The GB is a small portion of it is GB. Byfleet has already contributed significantly to housing provision in the GB. Its time for other parts of Surrey to contribute.	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	Byfleet is an island cut off by the M25, River Wey and railway line. The GB is a small portion of it is GB. Byfleet has already contributed significantly to housing provision in the GB. Its time for other parts of Surrey to contribute.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	Concerned that a petition containing 2500 signatures opposing GB development 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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	Concerned that a petition containing 2500 signatures opposing GB development 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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	The current infrastructure provision for Byfleet is inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	The current infrastructure provision for Byfleet is inadequate.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB15	Much of Byfleet is at risk of flooding. The development of land identified as GB15 will inevitable increase flood risk	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet already floods, more housing will exacerbate flooding problems.	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	Byfleet already floods, more housing will exacerbate flooding problems.	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	Parvis Road (A245) is single lane and is frequently gridlocked. More housing will make the road unusable.	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	Parvis Road (A245) is single lane and is frequently gridlocked. More housing will make the road unusable.	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB15	Roads in and around Byfleet are regularly congested Particularly on Parvis Road A245. Traffic as a result of GB15 will render the road unusable	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
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB15	GB15 should be removed from the proposals.	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB4	Site GB4 should be removed from the proposals.	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1313	Richard	Lovell	GB5	Site GB5 should be removed from the proposals.	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet is an island cut off by the M25, River Wey and railway line. The GB is a small portion of it is GB. Byfleet has already contributed significantly to housing provision in the GB. Its time for other parts of Surrey to contribute.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB5	Byfleet is an island cut off by the M25, River Wey and railway line. The GB is a small portion of it is GB. Byfleet has already contributed significantly to housing provision in the GB. Its time for other parts of Surrey to contribute.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet is an island cut off by the M25, River Wey and railway line. The GB is a small portion of it is GB. Byfleet has already contributed significantly to housing provision in the GB. Its time for other parts of Surrey to contribute.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Regard should be given to Byfleet's unique situation and the detrimental effect of further housing on Byfleet community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Refers to a petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Concerned that a petition containing 2500 signatures opposing GB development has been ignored. Oppose GB4 from proposals.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB5	Concerned that a petition containing 2500 signatures opposing GB development has been ignored. Oppose GB4 from proposals.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB15	Development on GB15 will increase the risk of flooding.	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 future flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet already floods, the removal of greenery will exacerbate flooding problems.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB5	Byfleet already floods, the removal of greenery will exacerbate flooding problems.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	Byfleet already floods, more housing will exacerbate flooding problems.	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	The Parvis Road A245 is the main road through Byfleet and often endures traffic gridlock. Additional housing will make the road unusable. The existing infrastructure is currently inadequate.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB4	<p>Parvis Road (A245) is single lane and is frequently gridlocked. More housing will make the road unusable.</p> <p>The current infrastructure provision for Byfleet is inadequate.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB5	<p>The Parvis Road A245 is the main road through Byfleet and often endures traffic gridlock. Additional housing will make the road unusable.</p> <p>The existing infrastructure is currently inadequate.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB15	Parvis Rd A245 is already severely congested. The level of development proposed will render the road unusable	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
1335	Suzanne	Lovell	GB15	GB15 should be removed from the proposal.	None stated.	Objection noted, however taking into consideration all the available evidence. The sites identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD are the most sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
855	Gary	Lowe	GB4	Upset about the loss of more green space. Becoming more a suburb rather than a village. Worried more hard surface in the area will divert water to existing older properties.	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
855	Gary	Lowe	GB5	Upset about the loss of more green space. Becoming more a suburb rather than a village. Worried more hard surface in	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	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the area will divert water to existing older properties.		<p>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>	of this representation
855	Gary	Lowe	GB4	Objects to further development in Byfleet. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. On-street parking is very congested and more people are parking illegally on grass verges, the problem should be monitored and addressed.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on illegal parking, the Local Planning Authority would recommend that this is brought to the attention of Woking Borough Council's Parking Services and the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
855	Gary	Lowe	GB5	Objects to further development in Byfleet. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. On-street parking is very congested and more people are parking illegally on grass verges, the problem should be monitored and addressed.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on illegal parking, the Local Planning Authority would recommend that this is brought to the attention of Woking Borough Council's Parking Services and the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
702	Michael	Luck	General	Byfleet will be gridlocked, Parvis Road A245 is already at capacity in the rush hours from the A3 to West Byfleet.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
702	Michael	Luck	GB17	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
702	Michael	Luck	Content of the Site Allocations DPD	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
702	Michael	Luck	Methodology	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
221	Anne	Luckham	GB9	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Any further encroachment on the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will make the two towns effectively one. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate village. The present infrastructure is incapable of dealing with more residents, cars and their needs for access to medical, education and social services. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposal can be developed without undermining the identity of Mayford as distinct from Guildford. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
221	Anne	Luckham	GB11	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Any further encroachment on the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will make the two towns effectively one. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate village. The present infrastructure is incapable of dealing with more residents, cars and their needs for access to medical, education and social services. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
221	Anne	Luckham	GB10	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Any further encroachment on the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will make the two towns effectively one. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate village. The present infrastructure is incapable of dealing with more residents, cars and their needs for access to medical, education and social services.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
221	Anne	Luckham	GB8	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Any further encroachment on the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will make the two towns effectively one. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate village. The present infrastructure is incapable of dealing with more residents, cars and their needs for access to medical, education and social services.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
221	Anne	Luckham	GB12	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Any further encroachment on the Green Belt between Woking and Guildford will make the two towns effectively one. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate village. The present infrastructure is incapable of dealing with more residents, cars and their needs for access to medical, education and social services.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release 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 County Council has confirmed that the educational needs to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools. The Council has carried out a number of studies to inform the DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review. It has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternatives sites. Collectively, the evidence suggests</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						supports the allocation of the sites and there is no inconsistency in the decisions made by the Council in that regard. The SA Report sets out why site have been supported and/or rejected for allocation.	
221	Anne	Luckham	GB7	I strongly object to increased Traveller Pitches. We already have several Traveller sites and should not be asked to provide additional amenities. Contribution towards the Traveller Community. Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on Green Belt openness grounds.	None stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The development of this site will damage the landscape and impact existing flora and fauna	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Development of GB15 will see the merging of Byfleet with West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly 10.3 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The existing trees around West Hall are beautiful and have multiple benefits including ability to reduce noise and pollution.	None stated.	<p>Development proposals will need meet all other relevant Development Plan Policies including robust policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies which seek to protect and encourage the creation of Green Infrastructure including trees. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes the retention and strengthening of woodland and parkland planting, and the requirement to conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise and ground contamination. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Development of GB15 will result in a significant encroachment into the countryside and Wey Canal	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 21.0 and Section 3.0 paragraph 3.7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The GB is designed to preserve the setting of the special character of historic towns. West Byfleet has a rich heritage and West Hall itself is a listed building.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Increase traffic on the already congested A245 would be disastrous. The proposed development at West Hall would increase the traffic and stretch it beyond normal peak times. The sustainable transport solutions, more bus stops, will not	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
				mitigate the impact or change lifestyle habits. The traffic studies undertaken on the A245 do not fully consider the impact in relation to other development sites in Byfleet and Pyrford. The proposed mitigation measure of introducing a new roundabout is inadequate to address the problems		<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>	
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The GB should assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land. It is not clear whether derelict brownfield sites have been exhausted before considering GB sites.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	GB15 is within FZ2, is in close proximity to the Wey navigation and the proposed development and removal of natural drainage will result in an increased risk of flooding.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>The site is wholly in Flood Zone 1. It is adjacent to land classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 (across the River Wey Navigation).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Development of the site will alter the character completely- this is contrary to GB purpose	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The development of this site is contrary to sustainability development principles e.g. the site is within FZ2 and development will increase surface water run off	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>The site is wholly in Flood Zone 1. It is adjacent to land classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 (across the River Wey Navigation).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The local infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the level of development planned for West Byfleet e.g. schools, health facilities, utilities are at or over capacity.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9, 3.10.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult with utility providers throughout the preparation of the DPD.</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
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Objects to GB15 as the site serves a main function of the GB to check urban sprawl. The proposal is contrary to this.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0</p> <p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	Proposals will impact on accessibility for the emergency services	None stated.	Emergency Services are consulted in the preparation of the DPD and have the opportunity to raise any concerns they may have.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB16	The Broadoaks proposal should increase housing provision over the proposed school. The proposed school will do little to alleviate the current shortage.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The local infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the level of development planned for West Byfleet e.g. schools, health facilities, utilities are at or over capacity. The site should be combined with GB17 as a SANG and GB maintained around West Byfleet.	Combine the site with GB17 for the area to be SANG	The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.8-3.10, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The Council is satisfied that the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0. The sites are being proposed for different uses in the DPD and therefore are identified separately in the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB17	The local infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the level of development planned for West Byfleet e.g. schools, health facilities, utilities are at or over capacity. The site should be combined with GB17 as a SANG and GB maintained around West Byfleet.	Combine the site with GB17 for the area to be SANG	The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.8-3.10, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The Council is satisfied that the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0. The sites are being proposed for different uses in the DPD and therefore are identified separately in the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1320	Gillan	Luff	GB15	The existing road infrastructure can not accommodate the level of development proposed. The A245 is already heavily congested and has become worse through ongoing development in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1320	Gillan	Luff	General	WBC and SCC should consider more radical alternatives to traffic problems along the A3 and M25. E.g. A dual carriageway from the A3 to Woking, Wisley, Sutton Green would improve the appeal of Woking as a residential, retail, commercial core with excellent rail and road links	None stated.	Surrey County Council are the Highway Authority and therefore are responsible for road infrastructure. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding an alternative highway solution in the form of a dual carriageway.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
644	Barbara	Lugton	GB2	Objects to the proposal. The Traveller site is already big enough and has been extended beyond what was originally planned.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
644	Barbara	Lugton	GB3	Objects to the proposal. The Traveller site is already big enough and has been extended beyond what was originally planned.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
644	Barbara	Lugton	GB3	The site would be better used for affordable housing, as proposed at the Coblands site.	The site would be better used for affordable housing, as proposed at the Coblands site.	Comment noted. However, the Council has a duty to meet identified need for traveller pitches, and this site is considered suitable to meet this need in comparison to reasonable alternatives sites. Further detail can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
644	Barbara	Lugton	GB2	The site would be better used for affordable housing, as proposed at the Coblands site.	The site would be better used for affordable housing, as proposed at the Coblands site.	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